

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Vol. XXV

JANUARY, 1947

No. 2

THE PURITAN SPIRIT IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY REFORM

Thomas P. Neill

SOME EARLY ASPECTS OF A BENEDICTINE CENTURY

Theodore Roemer

THE COUNCIL OF NICAEEA

Lowrie J. Daly

CARDINAL CONSALVI AND THE CONCORDAT OF 1801

Sr. M. John Francis

RECENT BOOKS IN REVIEW

St. Louis University
St. Louis 3, Mo.

\$1.00 a Year

25 cents a copy

The HISTORICAL BULLETIN

A CATHOLIC QUARTERLY

for Teachers and Students of History

Vol. XXV

JANUARY, 1947

No. 2

Editor: JOHN F. BANNON

Managing Editor: PETER L. DANNER

Business Editor: FRANCIS J. O'BRIEN

Associate Editors

ROBERT V. CALLEN
EDWARD J. STHOKAL
ROBERT H. NEUBECK
BERNARD J. COUGHLIN

WALTER H. HALLORAN
KENNETH J. HERIAN
MARSHALL B. WINKLER
JOSEPH H. GRIER

Advisory Editors

MARTIN P. HARNEY
THOMAS F. MAHER
CHARLES H. METZGER

W. PATRICK DONNELLY
PETER M. DUNNE
GERALD G. WALSH

Published quarterly in November, January, March, and May by the Missouri Province Educational Institute, St. Louis University, St. Louis 3, Mo. Entered as second-class matter January 7, 1932 at the Post Office at St. Louis, Mo., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on January 20, 1933. Address communications to the Managing Editor or to the Business Editor, *The Historical Bulletin*, 221 North Grand Blvd., St. Louis 3, Mo. *The Historical Bulletin* is indexed in the *Catholic Bookman* and *The Catholic Periodical Index*.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

THE PURITAN SPIRIT IN EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY REFORM	27
<i>Thomas P. Neill</i>	
SOME EARLY ASPECTS OF A BENEDICTINE CENTURY	29
<i>Theodore Roemer</i>	
THE COUNCIL OF NICAEA	31
<i>Lowrie J. Daly</i>	
CARDINAL CONSALVI AND THE CONCORDAT OF 1801	33
<i>Sr. M. John Francis</i>	
RECENT BOOKS IN REVIEW	43

CONTRIBUTORS

THOMAS P. NEILL, PH.D., is Assistant Professor of History at St. Louis University, where he also received his Doctorate degree. He is the author of *Weapons for Peace*, and *Makers of the Modern Mind*, soon to be published. He is a contributor to *The Catholic World*, *America*, *Commonweal*, and *The Modern Schoolman*.

THEODORE ROEMER, O.F.M., Cap., PH.D., is Professor of Modern History at St. Lawrence College, Mount Calvary, Wisconsin. He made his doctorate studies in history at Catholic University, and is the author of *The Ludwig-Missionsverein and the Church in the United States: 1838-1918*, and of *Ten Decades of Alms*, besides contributing to *Franciscan Studies*, and *THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN*.

LOWRIE J. DALY, S.J., M.A., is at present at St. Stanislaus Novitiate, Cleveland. He received his Master's degree from St. Louis University in 1942.

SR. M. JOHN FRANCIS, S.H.N., A.B., is completing her Master's thesis at Seattle College. She also teaches at Sacred Heart Academy, Salem, Oregon.

The Puritan Spirit in Eighteenth-Century Reform

Thomas P. Neill

St. Louis University

THE latter half of the eighteenth century was an age of reform. Everyone, from the emperor and kings down to minor writers, had his selected list of reform projects, typical of which are the Abbé Saint-Pierre's "Project for the Reform of Begging," "Project for Making Dukes and Peers Useful," and "Project for Making Peace Perpetual in Europe." This was an age which may have been disillusioned with the past and the present, but it looked forward eagerly, zealously to setting things right for the future. It would reform man's morals and manners, his government and business, his relations with his fellow men.

There seems, on the surface of things, to be a noticeable parallel between this reforming zeal of the latter eighteenth century and that of the seventeenth-century English Puritans whose "zeal for positive reform," Woodhouse points out, is one of their "most constant and indisputable notes."¹ Thus the Puritan Thomas Case could cry to Parliament: "Reform the cities . . . the countries . . . the sabbath, . . . the ordinances, the worship of God . . . *Every plant which my heavenly father hath not planted shall be rooted up.*" Certainly this reforming zeal had always played an essential role in Puritan plans for bringing about their *civitas dei* on this earth—from Calvin's reform of Geneva to the various Scottish and English covenants for a new way of life.

Historians have not generally adverted to the Puritan nature of eighteenth-century reform, it would seem, because it is not a religious age. But this fact does not preclude a secularized puritanism from playing a part in setting the accepted standards of social morality for this age of reform. Saint-Pierre's projects for the reform of begging and for making monks useful, for example, are in perfect harmony with the social teaching of the Calvinist sects. So too are the general reform plans of most benevolent despots. They would reform their various churches so as to eliminate waste and inefficiency: extra candles at high mass, unnecessary holy days, frequent processions, mendicant monks and cloistered clergy are always to be abolished in the name of efficiency and productivity. The benevolent despots themselves, in contrast to their fathers and grandfathers, take pride in being industrious "first servants of the state" who feared idleness and exalted busyness as only Calvin's spiritual children could do.

Now similarity between eighteenth-century reform pro-

jects and those of Calvin two centuries earlier does not of itself prove relationship between the two. But it does suggest the possibility that the latter may have somehow influenced the former. We wish to suggest this possibility as a subject for historical investigation which has been ignored in the past by historians for a number of reasons into which we cannot enter here.³ We shall therefore be content to suggest two points indicating the validity of such an investigation by 1) showing in summary fashion some points of similarity between Puritanism and eighteenth-century reform projects, and 2) tracing in rough outline the lineage whereby Calvin's ideas could have been passed down to these reformers of the eighteenth century.

Genesis of Reform Spirit

There have always been people in history who can loosely be called puritan, but modern puritanism stems from the Geneva of John Calvin. It was originally a way of life, including a theology, a morality, an economics, a politics and a sociology all bound closely together and dependent upon Calvin's two or three basic theological principles—the absolute sovereignty of an irresponsible God, the absolute depravity of all men, and the pre-election of some of them to salvation. From these logically flowed Calvin's social morality, which in the course of time became more important historically than his theological beliefs. The Elect exhibited certain virtues—industry, frugality, sobriety, high seriousness, diligence—whereby they could be distinguished from the rest of mankind. By these virtues they could be practically assured of their pre-election to salvation, though by the practice of them they could do nothing to earn it.

This was a religion and an attitude toward life that fitted in nicely with the business interests, the social aspirations, and the intellectual convictions of the middle class in Europe. Calvinism, in its various offshoots, is therefore found following the trade routes geographically and settling among the bourgeoisie socially. Its social

³ Until fairly recently the "Whig" school of historians maintained a near-monopoly of writing history in the English language. Members of the middle class and usually members of one of the Calvinist sects, these historians seem to have taken the bourgeois morality for granted as part of the progress stemming from the Reformation and the increasing civilization of man. In the last fifty years this outlook has been attacked from the class point of view by Marxists, from the moral and psychological point of view by Freudianism, from the historical point of view by more objective scholarship, and from the religious point of view by the general breakdown of Protestant sects, particularly the fundamentalists. It is therefore possible for the historian today to detach himself from the whiggish, puritan outlook that was for so long part of his predecessors' equipment.

¹ *Puritanism and Liberty—Being the Army Debates (1647-9) from the Clarke Manuscripts*, edited by A.S.P. Woodhouse (London, J. M. Dent and Sons, 1938), p. 43.

² *Ibid.*

attitudes soon penetrated into the non-Calvinistic religions in all those countries where any of the Puritan sects existed. And thus the Anglicans of England, the Catholics of France and Belgium, the Lutherans of Germany all came to adopt in some degree or other these social attitudes that can be called puritan.

By the latter part of the eighteenth century these social attitudes were about all that was left of Calvinism in most places. Its theology, except among the fundamentalists, had receded into the background, but its social teaching, its morality and its list of virtues lived on triumphant among the bourgeoisie. This secularization of religion through the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is a point the historian cannot afford to overlook, for the social reformers of the latter eighteenth century were men possessed of religious zeal and religious belief, though they were usually sceptical of theology and occasionally even atheistic. They had simply secularized religion and applied themselves to creating their heaven on earth with the same zeal as missionaries had shown in days gone by.⁴ They aimed at being virtuous, at being, indeed, the most virtuous of all men. Diderot typically insisted: "It is not enough to know more than they (the theologians) do; it is necessary to show them that we are better, and that philosophy makes more good men than sufficient or efficacious grace."⁵

So knowledge takes the place of grace. This world, in its immediate future, takes the place of heaven. Posterity takes the place of God. The *philosophes* have become the *Elect*, and all those who disagree with them are of the reprobate. Particularly sinful, of course, are the nobles who live such lazy, frivolous lives, who possess none of the puritan virtues, who have no reforming zeal. So, though Calvin's theology had been discarded, his reforming zeal and his social morality lived on among the middle class of the eighteenth century.

Two central facts must be remembered by one who would understand the spirit of eighteenth-century reformers. The first is France's focal position in European culture throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries—a fact universally adverted to by historians. The second, however, seems almost always overlooked: the fact that a vigorous, wealthy, influential minority in France was dominantly puritan in its outlook. Many French Huguenots remained in France after Louis XIV's revocation of the Edict of Nantes, and they continued as a group whose influence was disproportionate to its numbers.⁶ But more important than the Huguenots were the Jansenists, aptly termed by R. R. Palmer "the Puritans of the Catholic Church."⁷ Although Jansenism had been condemned by the papal bull *Unigenitus* in 1713,

many Jansenists persisted in their beliefs which they insisted had not been included in the condemnation, and they held closely to Calvin's position on social morality.

Their long struggle with the Jesuits, indeed, revealed that in many ways the Jansenists had the same viewpoint on man's nature, on sin, grace, and social virtues as did the Huguenots. The Jansenist group was strong among the professional classes. It came in time to be the predominant faction in the various parlements, and probably more than half the lawyers in France were Jansenist or Protestant by 1789. Jansenist influence on French thought earlier in the century is seen in such persons as Pascal and Quesnel, and after the overthrow of the Jesuits in 1764—which was as much a Jansenist victory as it was anything—Jansenist influence seems to have predominated in the schools, particularly among the Oratorians both in Paris and through the provinces.

Puritanism of the Encyclopedists

That group of reform thinkers referred to as the *philosophes*, who came to prominence after the middle of the century, was therefore exposed to puritan thinking. Even more exposed was the generation of middle class men who would direct the course of the Revolution after 1789. And despite their religious scepticism, these reform thinkers and revolutionary performers took to puritan ideas as good middle class people did before and after them. That is why Carl Becker calls them "the secular bearers of the Protestant and the Jansenist tradition."⁸ The *Encyclopédie* was conceived of by its editors and accepted by its readers as a vast project for reforming the world according to the new dispensation. Diderot, editor of the *Encyclopédie* and central figure of this group of thinkers, exhibits many typical puritan leanings. He objects to Christianity for its wastefulness in burning candles, in holding unnecessary processions, in throwing money away so lavishly on decorations, in condemning so many men to a life of celibacy and asceticism. He warns against its prodigal charity, for this encourages many people to live idly and uselessly rather than to put their energy to productive labor.

Nor was Diderot a unique figure among these middle class reformers. His chief associate, the brilliant mathematician D'Alembert, was a Jansenist whom his instructors hoped to make a second Pascal. These two men, above all others, gave the *Encyclopédie* its tone, but their associates and their contributors seem to have agreed with them in possessing and exalting the puritan virtues.⁹ The various articles glorify bustling activity, reproducing in great detail the workings of glass furnaces, gunpowder mills and silk calenders with a zeal, a tenderness and a devotion given to few other subjects. A careful reading of various articles in the *Encyclopédie* suggests that the editors transferred to these articles on industry the same amount of devotion and respect which they had denied to religion proper. D'Alembert asserted specifically in his *avertissement* to the third volume that "details of economy, and of arts and trades, have as good

(Please turn to page thirty-seven)

⁴ The late Carl Becker treats this point well in his *Heavenly City of the Eighteenth-Century Philosophers* (New Haven, Yale University Press, 1932).

⁵ *Oeuvres complètes de Diderot* (Paris, Garnier Freres, 1875), XIX, 464.

⁶ This was true for psychological, religious, and social reasons, as well as economic. As the nucleus of the rising bourgeoisie, a group wealthy enough to devote themselves to intellectual pursuits, the Huguenots were disproportionately influential. Economically they were very important. Max Beer shows in his *Inquiry into Physiocracy* (London, Macmillan & Co., 1939) how Frenchmen tended to identify any industrial activity with the Huguenots.

⁷ *Catholics and Unbelievers in Eighteenth Century France* (Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1939), p. 29.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, p. 42.

⁹ All was not sweet unanimity among the Encyclopedists, to be sure, but none of the various fallings-out seems to have been over the point of puritan virtue or middle-class morality, on which they all seem agreed.

Some Early Aspects of a Benedictine Century

Theodore Roemer, O. F. M. Cap.

St. Lawrence College

IN this centenary year of Benedictine achievement within the United States the one Benedictine of 1846, Father Boniface Wimmer, has been multiplied to more than two thousand monks; the little monastery of St. Vincent in Pennsylvania has expanded into twenty-one fully constituted abbeys, in two separate congregations, and several independent priories. It may therefore be interesting to delve into the beginnings of this organization.

The coming of the Benedictines to our country is part and parcel of the mission movement that originated in the nineteenth century. The first of these movements became a reality in 1822, when the French Society for the Propagation of the Faith was organized as a general mission society, but through the endeavors of Bishop William Louis Du Bourg, S.S., of Louisiana it early developed a particular trend to the needs of the Church in the United States. This trend was crystallized into solely helping the Church in North America when Father Frederick Rese was instrumental in having the Leopoldinen-Stiftung founded in the Austrian Empire in the year 1829. As bishop of Detroit, in 1838, he induced Louis I of Bavaria to establish the Ludwig-Missionsverein in his country for the needs of the missions of Asia and North America. This was the society that had much to do with the coming of the Benedictines to the United States.¹ To appreciate the connection something of the background must be known.

The Rev. Joseph Ferdinand Mueller, business manager and factotum of the Ludwig-Missionsverein for many years, wrote in 1849 concerning one of the purposes of the society:

Since the Ludwig-Missionsverein came into existence in Bavaria this society has aimed to help its German countrymen in the States of North America. Up to that time, 1839, only individual missionaries had gone there to bring religious consolation to the widely scattered Germans, for the bishops wanted all of them to become English and consistently invited only such priests who could speak English, and no Germans. But the number of immigrants increased. More than 100,000 arrived every year. Last year this number rose to 250,000, as the bishops assembled for the council in Baltimore attested. Because of the rapid increase of Germans something had to be done about their religious education, so that they might not be abandoned entirely and become a prey to heresy or rank infidelity, and that at least some of them might have the consolation of making their last confession in their mother tongue. Even though the second and third generations will have become entirely English—the German instinct of imitation lets us expect nothing else—there still were and are many hundred thousands who do not understand English and do not want to learn the language. Therefore care had to be taken that this multitude would not remain deprived of religious instruction and training.²

At first this purpose could not easily be attained because the society was closely connected with the French Society for the Propagation of the Faith. Therefore King Louis decided in 1844 that his society must break all re-

lations with the French association so that more attention might be given to the ever growing needs of the Germans in the United States. Concerning these thoughts and actions of the king a rather recent German writer states:

The sympathy of King Louis for the fate of the Germans in America was in pleasing contrast with the interest commonly shown in Germany at that time. . . . While such enterprises had nothing more in view than economic aims and consequently often brought upon the emigrants the painful results of a mis-carried colonization project, King Louis consistently refused to encourage emigration. He was intent, however, on securing the cultural advantages of Church and school, in the country beyond the sea, for those Germans who refused to stay at home, thereby helping them to succeed and providing a bond with the old fatherland. At first these were, of course, only groping attempts. . . . They were however engendered by the deep German convictions of the king and were in consonance with the spirit of the times and the conditions in America. They were furthermore supported by a decided and deeply set religious sentiment.³

Naturally the first attempts were hesitant. No detailed and particular data concerning the needs were available, even though a general account had been given by the Austrian Canon Salzbacher in his *Meine Reise nach Nordamerika im Jahre 1842*. The conviction was quite general, however, that the most important matter was to provide more German-speaking priests. Views differed as to the methods to be employed. Some were satisfied that the need could be sufficiently supplied by volunteers from Germany. King Louis insisted that special seminaries were necessary. He was intrigued by the plan of Bishop Henni to provide a seminary in his diocese of Milwaukee, which was in the midst of German immigrants. The Plan was however delayed; and when the first attempts of the Redemptorists to erect a seminary in Baltimore proved abortive, Louis ordered peremptorily that a seminary be set up at Altoetting in Bavaria, under the guidance of the German Redemptorists. He set the full machinery of the Ludwig-Missionsverein in motion to finance and control the undertaking.

At this juncture Father Frederick von Held, the Belgian Redemptorist provincial who then had jurisdiction over the American Redemptorists, arrived in Munich and gave a report on his visit to the American houses of the congregation. His ideas were expressed in a report of the Bavarian Minister Abel to King Louis as follows:

Animated by the thought that there is nothing more important than to preserve the Catholic faith and the German national character in the Germans of North America and thus to remove them from religious and political perversion, he [Father von Held] has developed with convincing arguments the statement that—just because the German missionary in North America must above all help the German emigrants in their religious needs and keep the German element beyond the ocean free from deterioration—the erection of special institutions to prepare German missionaries is not at all necessary. Since nothing else is demanded of these missionaries than that they be distinguished and faithful German priests, filled with zeal and devotion to duty, their education is sufficiently cared for in

¹ For details concerning these societies see the present writer's *Ten Decades of Alms* and *The Ludwig-Missionsverein and the Church in the United States (1838-1918)*. Whenever not otherwise indicated, the facts in this article are substantiated in these volumes.

² Munich *Annalen der Glaubensverbreitung*, XVII (1849), 434.

³ Wilhelm Winkler, "Koenig Ludwig I von Bayern und die deutschen Katholiken in Nordamerika," *Historisch-politische Blätter*, CLXIX (1922), 705-720.

every religious novitiate and clerical seminary. Therefore it would be much more beneficial to have all available funds applied to the erection of Catholic churches and the strengthening of the missions already in existence. Every order could supply enough missionaries without a special mission house, for every novitiate is even now a mission house.⁴

The king bowed down to the seemingly inevitable conclusion, which was also shared by many others, and ordered that the Altoetting seminary project be dropped. Yet he could not refuse himself the satisfaction of adding on the margin of the Abel note: "But can it be asserted with any degree of certainty that without a mission house a sufficient number of Catholic German priests will always be found for America?"⁵ The same idea was also expressed in a letter to Father von Held by the Redemptorists in Vienna:

We were thoroughly frightened by what you wrote from Munich concerning the mission house. It would be too bad, and in our opinion of the greatest disadvantage at least in the more distant future, if the founding of a mission house were abandoned. It seems that Your Reverence was too hasty in agreeing to the proposition; and we are of the opinion that you should have interposed all your authority to have it carried out. . . . In time missionaries will be more important than money subsidies. The existence of such a mission house would assure both in the future, while mere money subsidies are in time more or less diminished from various causes and may be stopped entirely.⁶

Enter the Benedictines

As far as the Redemptorists were concerned, the seminary project of the Ludwig-Missionsverein had come to an end, even though they continued to be the beneficiaries of rather extensive financial aid. But at this very time the king was gratified in having his pet project approached from another angle in an article written anonymously for the *Augsburger Postzeitung* by Father Boniface Wimmer, O.S.B. His proposal was the following:

The mission seminary ought not be built in Germany, not even in Europe, but in America. Since large sums of money would be necessary to erect and keep up a suitable building, to secure an endowment fund sufficiently large to keep teachers and provide for the needs of the pupils, and because it would be difficult to obtain the proper persons to take over the administration and the teaching duties, finally because the existence of such an institution would always remain in doubt, I suggested that the funds be applied to found Benedictine monasteries. The members of this order would consider it their first and earnest duty to engage in missionary work and to educate boys and young men as missionaries for the Americans. In order to be successful they would have to buy large tracts of land and cultivate them with the help of lay brothers. Thus they would have sufficient means to provide for the needs of all in the seminary.⁷

This proposal of Father Boniface did not spring from a sudden enthusiastic impulse. He had long considered the possibility of becoming a missionary in the United States, and had importuned his superiors for the necessary permission. It had been refused consistently because his own abbey at Metten was only then reviving from the ravages of secular suppression and he himself was considered too valuable a person to be lost in this critical period. But he explained:

In all these matters I felt most keenly that no one seemed to think of the Benedictines, as if it were a proven fact that they were not fit to become missionaries, much less to train missionaries. Therefore I considered it a duty to defend my order. I did it in an article for the *Augsburger Postzeitung*, in which I tried to show that, more than any other order, the Benedictines were

well suited to found and govern a mission seminary and thereby help to remove the dire need of priests, "if the order would be introduced to the United States and would again take on the character it possessed when it was in its most flourishing condition."⁸

Interest in this project immediately became quite general, and Father Boniface was called upon to prove his statements by action. As he says:

This proposition found a kindly hearing and was given approval. Msgr. Morrichini, papal nuncio, Graf von Reisach, coadjutor bishop and later archbishop, and the members of the central council of the Ludwig-Missionsverein sanctioned the proposal and ordered the business manager, Court chaplain Mueller, to offer 6000 gulden to me if I should venture to carry out the proposal. The abbot of Metten was also agreeable to permit my departure for this purpose.⁹

St. Vincent's

And thus Father Boniface Wimmer set about carrying out his project. Many considered it a fantastic scheme, even more so when he was ready to depart with four students and fifteen mechanics and farmers—he the only Benedictine among them—to found a Benedictine monastery in the wilds of the New World. Somewhat more good feeling ensued when he agreed to take over the property that had been acquired by the Rev. Peter Lemke at Carrolltown, Pennsylvania, for a German congregation. And so this motley group set sail for New York, July 25, 1846. Having made further arrangements in the city, they were conducted to St. Joseph's at Carrolltown by Father Lemke himself. Father Boniface writes:

One of the first things I did was to announce my arrival to Bishop O'Connor of Pittsburgh and referring to my earlier letters from Germany, to offer him my services. He answered by the next mail, welcomed me, and graciously invited me to visit him at Pittsburgh as soon as possible. I heeded the invitation, went to Pittsburgh, and presented myself to the bishop. The purpose of my coming was naturally the topic of our conversation. When I declared verbally, as previously by letter, that it was my intention to found a monastery that would also contain a mission seminary, he immediately stated that St. Joseph's (Carrolltown) was not suitable for the purpose, but that he had a place he could and would give to me, for it was better situated for my plans and also had many Germans. He said that it would not be far out of my way to inspect the place on my return. I could not well refuse this invitation, and the next day, together with the bishop, I visited the place—it was St. Vincent.¹⁰

As can be sensed from the foregoing, the place immediately struck the fancy of the missionary. The surroundings were better, and the terms of the bishop seemed so much more favorable than those of Father Lemke that Father Boniface decided to make St. Vincent the site of his new foundation. When the news of this change of location from a German settlement to a mixed congregation reached Munich, it brought the admonition of Father Mueller: "If, therefore, you want to count on our continued assistance, I must insist that you do not neglect the Germans."¹¹ But he also added: "I notice how God has directed everything for the best. You have settled at St. Vincent. So far so good."¹² Father Boniface had no intention of abandoning his original plan to work for the Germans and to provide priests for them. He found St. Vincent the better place for the purpose, and took it, even though it was in the midst of a mixed congregation. He knew that the future development of the Benedictines

(Please turn to page thirty-nine)

⁴ *Bavarian Royal Archives*, Louis I, XXI, 586. Cited P. Willibald Mathaer, O.S.B., *Der Ludwig-Missionsverein in der Zeit Koenig Ludwig I von Bayern*, pp. 230-231.

⁵ *Ibid.* p. 231.

⁶ *Ibid.* p. 233.

⁷ *Munich Annalen der Glaubensverbreitung*, XXIV (1856), 371-397.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹ Mueller to Wimmer, December 23, 1846. Cited P. Oswald Moosmueller, O.S.B., *Bonifaz Wimmer*, p. 71.

¹² *Ibid.*

The Council of Nicaea

Lowrie J. Daly, S. J.

St. Stanislaus Novitiate

THE Councils of the Church are vital to European civilization. As Chesterton brilliantly wrote:

Many a man would be dead today if his doctors had not debated fine shades about doctoring. European civilization would be dead today if its doctors of divinity had not debated fine shades about doctrine. Nobody will ever write a history of Europe that will make any sort of sense until he does justice to the Councils of the Church, those vast yet subtle collaborations for thrashing out a thousand thoughts to find the true thought of the Church.¹

And among the great Councils of the Church, the one held at Nicaea in 325 ranks very high. True, some historians can see nothing more to it than philosophical hair-splitting about the term "homoiousios" or "homouiosios". Others would say that the upshot of it all was that, "... ultimately therefore, like Neo-Platonism and other pagan schools of philosophy Christianity made use of the sacred number three. If the very abstruse dogma of the Trinity could not be understood, the theological formula that expressed it could at any rate be believed in as a mystical formula."² To such historians theological distinctions are mere quibbles. They do not realize that, "What are called the fine doctrinal distinctions are not dull. They are like the finest operations of surgery; separating nerve from nerve but giving life. The theologian is dealing with living ideas, and if he draws a line between them, it is naturally a very fine line."³

Backgrounds to the Arian Controversy⁴

In the history of the Church it would seem that it is the unexpected which usually happens. This may be only another way of saying that the Church is something supernatural with more than human enemies and more than human helps. At any rate, the unexpected certainly began happening about the year of Our Lord 325.

First, a few words to refresh one's picture of the times. The Edict of Milan of 313, whether it really came from Constantine directly in the form we know it today or not, certainly expressed his mind in the matter of tolerating Christianity.⁵ The Diocletian persecutions which began in 303, violent, very systematic, were now only bitter memories. The western rivals of Constantine had been eliminated, and now he in the West and Licinius in the East were supreme Augusti. Though much in favor of Catholicism, Constantine did not become a Catholic

until shortly before his death. His knowledge of Catholicism was hazy throughout his life—a fact which must be kept in mind.⁶ But to the host of Christian bishops, priests and people, the appearance of an emperor openly favorable to Catholicism was like a dream. It simply swept them off their feet.

But there was a reverse side to the picture. During the persecutions many Catholics had openly apostatized. Many others had handed over to the ignorant officers other books than the Sacred Scriptures and by means of this ruse had secured a bill of immunity. Because of such people, together with the puritanical attitude of some other Catholics and jealousies among the clerics, there had arisen a great schism in Africa called Donatism. Donatists and Catholics both had their own bishops and clergy, and fought over possession of the churches in the various cities and towns of North Africa. The Donatists had given Constantine so much trouble that he attempted to use force upon them, but without much success. Finally, in 321 he had given them a sort of Act of Toleration, and a peace more apparent than real settled over Africa.

Then, too, in the years after 313 Licinius and Constantine had not seen eye to eye in the matter of Catholicism and its toleration. In 320 Licinius began a sort of persecution of the Catholics. At last open war broke out between the two Emperors and in 324 Licinius was defeated. The Roman World then beheld a single emperor vested with complete power, and the Catholics felt sure that Constantine was at heart one of them. The future of the Church looked absolutely glorious. Then the unexpected happened. For it was just at this time that a quarrel between Arius, a priest of Alexandria, and Alexander, his bishop, reached its climax. Both were influential men and had come to intellectual strangleholds on the question of the relationship between God the Father and Our Lord, His Son.

Constantine wrote them both a rather naive letter in which he told them that he had learned:

... with great sorrow that sharper controversies than those of Africa (the Donatist disputes) have arisen at Alexandria although it appears to him that they are questions respecting things of no importance and of no use, which Alexander ought not to have excited and about which Arius ought to have kept his different views to himself. ... He thought they could easily be reconciled as they did not disagree on any main point of law. ... Philosophers of the same school had often differed in accessories. ... They ought to agree therefore and free him from a cause of so great anxiety. ...⁷

But the question was not to be settled so easily.

The Doctrine of Arianism

We have two letters of Arius himself (one written to his bishop) and fragments of his work, *Thalia*. These, together with some writings by other Arians, the many creeds of the Arian and semi-Arian synods, and the works of men like Athanasius and Hilary of Poitiers give us a pretty complete picture of Arian doctrine.

⁶ Cf. the summary of Constantine's attitude in Fliche-Martin, *op. cit.*, II, 62ff.

⁷ Eusebius, *Vita Constantini*. Translation quoted from Hefele, *op. cit.*, I, 260.

¹ *Resurrection of Rome*, p. 62; *The Thing*, p. 217.

² Thompson-Johnson, *Introduction to Medieval Europe*, p. 40. This work is, unfortunately, permeated with the historical inaccuracy of Modernism.

³ G. K. Chesterton, *loc. cit.*

⁴ For more detailed treatment than can be given in this brief essay cf. for an excellent presentation of the whole Arian question: Bardy, "La Crise Arienne" in *Histoire de L'Eglise* ed. Fliche-Martin, vol. II, (1936) 62-299; Hefele, *History of Church Councils* (trans. Clark) vols. I, II; Poulet-Raemers, *Church History*, I (briefer but well done); Tixeront, *History of Dogma*, vol. II; Bachelet, "Arianisme" in the *Dictionnaire de Theologie Catholique*, I, 2, cols. 1779-1863; G. Fritz, "Nicee" I Concile, *Dictionnaire de Theo. Cath.* (henceforth cited DTC) XI, 399-417. There is a lengthy bibliographical note in Fliche-Martin, *op. cit.*, II, 69-71. Mourret-Thompson, *Hs. of the Catholic Church*, II.

⁵ Fliche-Martin, *op. cit.*, II, 23.

At the root of Arianism is the concept that God the Father is Unbegotten and the Son is Begotten, but that begotten means created and unbegotten, uncreated. Secondly, for them the term "generation" always means something which has a beginning. Complete Arianism is a mixture of many things, taking much from the philosophy of Philo⁸. Like Philo it exaggerates in a Deistic sort of way the separation between God and the world and makes a Creator who is uninterested in the world far below. It is necessary to have some sort of go-between. This is the Logos, who is therefore inferior to the supreme God, neither consubstantial nor co-eternal with Him. But the Arian Logos, unlike the Gnostic Demiurge, does not cease to act as long as the world exists. The Arians loved to harp on the phrase from Proverbs (8/22) "The Lord possessed me in the beginning of his ways before he made anything from the beginning . . .", following the Septuagint version, "The Lord has created me . . ."

In his letter to his bishop, Arius stated his position clearly:

There is only one true God, alone uncreated, eternal without beginning; before time he begot his only Son but not in appearance. (Arius believed eternal generation was an appearance because he attached to all real generation some priority similar to time.) The Son is a perfect creature of God, created by will of God before all time. Thus there are three persons, God who is the cause of all things, unique and without beginning; the Son begotten of the Father before all things, created and established before the worlds. He was not until he was begotten.⁹

In the *Thalia*, which Arius' followers revered as a second Bible, he says:

God has not always been Father; there was a moment when He was alone and was not yet Father; later He became so. The Son is not from eternity; He came from nothing. When God wished to create us, He first created a being which He called the Logos, Wisdom and Son, who should create us as an instrument. . . . The Logos did not perfectly know the Father; the substances of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are entirely different. . . .⁹

Besides drawing on Philo, Arius seems to have taken some of his ideas from St. Lucian, martyr under Maximian. Lucian at one time defended the heresy of Paul of Samosata that Christ was a mere man and the Logos impersonal, but he retracted and developed another theory not clearly known to us. Bishop Alexander accuses Arius of drawing heretical ideas from this writer, seemingly the idea that the Son was not eternal. Some think Arius drew on Platonism; others accuse him of being too much of an Aristotelian.¹⁰

To sum up, Arianism is a syncretism containing elements from Philo, the Origenists and Lucian, and clothing itself in Aristotelian dialectic. Its foundations are philosophical rather than theological.

*Arian Arguments*¹¹

What were the arguments which Arians used to prove their concept of the Trinity? First they overworked their beloved text from Proverbs (8/22) already cited. Then they pointed out that Paul said, "Those whom he has foreknown he has also predestined to become conformed to the image of his Son, that he should be the first born

among many brethren" (Rom. 8/28), and again, "He is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature" (Col. 1/15). Next they presented the texts in which it is said: "This is eternal life that they may know thee, the only true God and Jesus Christ whom thou has sent" (John 17/23) and "the Father is greater than I" (John 14/28). Or they would argue from the fact that Our Lord says: "Amen I say to you, the Son can do nothing of himself" (John 5/19), and "I do as the Father commanded me"; and from the statements of Paul that Christ was "obedient unto death", and that "God raised Jesus from the dead" (Rom. 8/11); and from Our Lord's statement about the end of the world, "but of that day . . . no man knoweth, neither the angels in Heaven, nor the Son but the Father . . ." The reader will note that the technique has a familiar ring; use of obscure texts isolated from context, silence about other scriptural passages which clearly show the true doctrine.

Arius also seems to have made some use of a patristic argument. In this he had some dynamite at hand; for, though many of the earlier writers were excellent as witness of the traditional belief in the Trinity, their explanations left much to be desired. Many had used unfortunate expressions. Tertullian, for example, wrote that, "the Father is the whole substance of which the Son is a part". Origen would almost seem to say that the Son is inferior to the Father, while the apologists like Justin and Athenagoras, in trying to accommodate themselves to the Platonic ideas which their opponents had about the Logos, were not always successful. In going in the door of their enemies they sometimes got their fingers caught.¹²

But above all, the Arians were logicians and philosophers who applied their notions of human generation *univocally* to divine generation. Though they admitted that time began with creation, nevertheless they spoke of a priority similar to a priority in time of the Father to the Son.

Arius Himself

Arius was probably from Lydia and, according to Epiphanius, was a man of almost sixty in 311. He was a tall, thin, ascetic-looking fellow, very clever with his syllogisms, a dialectician without equal, and stubborn as a mule. He had a smooth and engaging personality; in fact, Epiphanius likens him to a perfidious serpent. Arius recognized the value of propaganda and later on he wrote theological ditties for sailors and laborers, insinuating his heresy with tuneful and, according to Athanasius, even vulgar melodies. At one time, Arius had been mixed up in the Meletian schism but had cleared himself and, according to Sozomen,¹³ he had the high respect of his own bishop up to the time of their quarrel.

First Skirmishes

The Arian question began either as early as 318 according to some calculations or perhaps as late as 323.¹⁴ Though the dates are not well fixed, the general outline of what went on is fairly clear. The tenor of Arius' teach-

(Please turn to page forty)

⁸ Hefele, *op. cit.*, I, 240; DTC, I, (1875) Fliche-Martin, *op. cit.*, II, 72.

⁹ Hefele, *op. cit.*, 256ff., whose translation is the one used.

¹⁰ DTC, I, (1790).

¹¹ An excellent presentation, analysis and complete refutation of the Arian arguments will be found in St. Thomas' *Contra Gentes*, IV, cc 6, 7, 8.

¹² On this matter cf. Tixeront, *History of Dogma*, I, 313ff.

¹³ *Ecc. Hist.*, I, 15, quoted from Mourret-Thompson *op. cit.*, II, 11.

¹⁴ Fliche-Martin, *op. cit.*, II, 71, note 2.

Cardinal Consalvi and the Concordat of 1801

Sr. M. John Francis, S. H. N.

Sacred Heart Academy

THE diplomatic career of Cardinal Consalvi affords several fields for historical research, each significant for its bearing upon church and state: namely, his influence in France in negotiating the Concordat of 1801, his place in Anglo-Papal relations from 1814-1824, and his position at the Congress of Vienna. It is the scope of this paper to set forth his role as negotiator of the Concordat of 1801. To this great Secretary of State belongs the distinction of having played the most prominent role in the negotiations. Cardinal Consalvi's entire career in the service of the Church showed him to be a prelate wholly devoted to the interests of the Church, ready to face any danger, even exile itself, if it meant the preservation of the Church's authority, spiritual or temporal. One could expect his friends to laud him highly, but, when his enemies praise him, then that is sure testimony of his greatness. Cacault, Napoleon's emissary at Rome, speaks of the Cardinal in these words:

The Pope is very attached to Cardinal Consalvi, his protégé, a man of forty-four years, active, industrious and capable.¹

You know well that the Cardinal does not come to Paris to sign that which the Pope has refused to sign at Rome; but he is the first minister of the Holy Father and his favorite. It is the soul of the Pope who goes to enter into communication with you. . . . He is a man of clarity of vision. His person is not imposing, he is not large; his eloquence, a little verbose, is not fascinating.²

When Consalvi is hesitant about going to Paris to negotiate with Napoleon, Cacault reassures him, "There are misunderstandings. The First Consul does not know you; still less does he know your talents, your ability, your engagements, your desire of terminating affairs."³

Napoleon recognized in Consalvi a man of unbending will in matters involving principle. It is not amazing then that these two statesmen would clash on almost every issue.⁴

Behind the great statesman, Consalvi, stood Pope Pius VII firm in his conviction that a strong Papacy meant a Papacy independent of a temporal ruler. He had the heroic example of other pontiffs who had faced just such

obstacles as now confronted him. Thus he gave his every effort to secure to the Catholics of France the right freely to practice their religion. His role in negotiating the Concordat was not that of an active participant but that of one who scrutinized each article of the proposal. Many of his contemporaries accused him of playing into the hands of Napoleon, of forsaking the cause of royalty so intimately bound up with the cause of the Church. Those who did so forgot that it was the duty of the Supreme Shepherd to restore faith to France, not to establish a form of government. Mathieu puts it very aptly:

The king had thus succeeded in organizing the Church of France without a Pope, God imposed on the Pope the obligation of organizing the Church of France without the king.⁵

The reorganization of the Church in France necessitated lengthy negotiations. These negotiations may be considered under three distinct phases: the first, at Paris, Nov. 5, 1890—March 10, 1801; the second, at Rome, March 10, 1801—June 6, 1801; and the third, at Paris, June 6, 1801—July 15, 1801. The proposals of the first phase, or the work of Spina and Bernier, were sent to Rome for approval, but approval was not given because of the clauses relative to divorce, married clergy, church property. Furthermore, the Pope could not confirm the appointment of bishops consecrated without his consent, nor would he tolerate an ecclesiastical council in France claiming supremacy over Rome.⁶

At Rome a counter project, sometimes referred to as the sixth project, was proposed, but before it reached Paris, Napoleon had sent his ultimatum to Rome that unless his draft were adopted within five days, negotiations would be broken off. Cacault was to leave Rome immediately and hasten toward Florence, where General Murat lay, at the head of the French army in Italy. Cacault saved the rupture between church and state by persuading the Pope to allow Cardinal Consalvi to go to Paris. Thus began the third and most important phase of the Concordat.

Consalvi in Paris

Cardinal Consalvi left Rome with Cacault on June 6, 1801.⁷ He arrived in Paris on June 20, 1801, where he took up his residence with Spina and Caselli at l'Hotel

¹ Francis Cardinal Mathieu, *Le Concordat de 1801 Ses Origines, Son Histoire*, Paris, Purin et cie, 1904, p. 170.

² *Ibid.*, p. 194.

³ A. F. Artaud de Montor, *Lives and Times of the Popes*, Vol. VIII, New York, Catholic Publication Society of America, 1911, p. 21.

⁴ Napoleon, after the liberation of Pope Pius from Fontainebleau, is said to have remarked to a companion as they saw Cardinal Consalvi: "He is a man who does not wish to appear to be a priest but he is more a priest than all the rest of them." John Tracy Ellis, *Cardinal Consalvi and Anglo Papal Relations 1814-1842* (Washington, Catholic University Press of America, 1942) p. 185. As an explanation of what Napoleon might have meant Ellis has this to say: "The remark may have been a cut at the Cardinal's ecclesiasticism or it may have been a compliment, but whatever way one interprets it, one cannot escape the implication that it paid tribute to the sternness with which Consalvi adhered to what he believed to be right." Ellis gives as his authority F. Nielsen, *History of the Papacy in the XIX Century*, I, p. 338, who in turn gives J. L. S. Bartholdy, *Gründzüge aus dem Leben des Cardinal H. Consalvi* (Stuttgart, 1825), p. 55. It is interesting to note in connection with Cardinal Consalvi that he was not a priest, but had advanced to the diaconate. Both Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 214 and Wiseman, *Recollections of the Last Four Popes*, p. 39, mention this fact.

⁵ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 24.

⁶ Jackson to Hawkesbury, June 20, 1801, Boulay, *Documents Poe sur la negociation du Concordat entra la France et le saint Siege 1800-1801*, Tome III, 1892, No. 521, pp. 500, 501.

⁷ There are two sources of information for all this material, the *Mémoires du Cardinal Consalvi* and the official dispatches of Consalvi to Doria. In essentials there is very little difference. The discrepancies can be accounted for by the fact that in writing his *Mémoires*, Cardinal Consalvi was in exile at Rheims, 1812, at the command of Napoleon. No access to records was available. Severity in treating his persecutor might be expected. According to Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 209, the translator of the *Mémoires* has given an exact translation, interpolating in only one small incident, confer footnote no. 36. Mathieu uses as his source the dispatches of Consalvi to Doria as given by Boulay in his *Documents*, confer footnote no. 10. Only Tomes II and III of this valuable source were available to me. The documents in these volumes are given in the original language.

de Rome. On June 21, he met Bernier who arranged an audience with Napoleon for the following day. Since the audience was not a private one, it did not admit of a thorough discussion of the difficulties. Napoleon maintained that he would never consent to the changes suggested by Rome, and that the project about to be presented admitted of the only changes possible. The Concordat must be signed within five days.⁸

Cardinal Consalvi was most meticulous in the wording of every article of the proposals. As he saw the situation it was absolutely necessary for the government, in order to safeguard the purity of dogma and the free exercise of religion, not only to recognize the Catholic religion as "that of the majority of the French citizens" but also to proclaim that Faith the religion of the government. Napoleon was willing to concede the first clause, but not the second. A second issue at stake was the position of the bishops. Napoleon demanded that all the Bishops, Constitutional and émigré, resign and that the "two governments would fix the new bishoprics." It was over these two points that Consalvi and Bernier labored at first.

Bernier, in rejecting the counter project, or sixth project of Rome, sent to Consalvi a seventh project on June 25, 1801. It was the preamble of this project which Consalvi felt obliged to revise.⁹ No mention is made that the Catholic religion is the faith of the government; laws contrary to the free exercise of religion are not revoked, and the bishops are to be "exhorted to resign" and their sees are to be designated by the phrase "*reputés vacants*." Bernier in sending this project to Consalvi wrote a note, in which he exhorts Consalvi to accept the project, to terminate useless debates which have gone on for eight months. The very tone of this note and the tenor of a conversation held with Talleyrand on the same day gave the Cardinal to understand that France had made its last concessions, and that this was the final draft.

Cardinal Consalvi had been authorized by Rome "to modify, in case of extreme necessity, the pontifical text, but on the condition that the changes did not alter the substance."¹⁰ Bernier's seventh project was drastically different from the pontifical text. Consalvi, Spina and Caselli, working from ten in the evening until four in the morning, drew up a draft, following in essentials the counter project, while admitting the one or two minor changes proposed by Bernier.

This draft met with caustic comment from Talleyrand who accused Consalvi of a spirit of chicanery and of quarreling. It was an unjust accusation. Consalvi realized the difficult position of the French government, saw the impossibility facing it:

To engage itself by a public act, to defend the purity of dogma and the exercise of ecclesiastical discipline and to revoke the laws contrary to it.¹¹

At the same time, though, he saw full well his responsibility to the Papacy. The phrase he insisted upon adding to the preamble of Bernier's seventh project was "*la professant en son particulier*."¹² Hence it would read in part:

⁸ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 211.

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 220.

¹⁰ *Pouvoirs pour Consalvi*, June 5, 1801. Boulay, *Documents*, Tome II, No. 516, pp. 484-486.

¹¹ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 224.

¹² Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 224.

The government of the French Republic recognizes that the Catholic, apostolic and Roman religion is that of the majority of the French citizens and professes it in particular.¹³

This simple statement would have satisfied the Papacy and justified its concessions without harming the government, in as much as it implied only the obligation to be Catholic by virtue of the constitution.

The first article was also changed because of its deep implications. Consalvi stated it as follows:

The exercise of the Catholic, apostolic and Roman religion will be free and public in France. The obstacles which oppose it will be removed.¹⁴

It is the last phrase of this article which Consalvi saw as so essential.

A section of Article four was also altered by Consalvi:

The First Consul, a Catholic, will nominate the archbishops and bishops.

He insisted that he who would be conceded the authority to nominate a spiritual ruler would of necessity also be a Catholic. There were other minor changes made by Consalvi in the seventh draft.

On July 30, 1801, Consalvi received word¹⁵ from Bernier that his proposal was rejected. The government insists upon the seventh project as given on June 25. Bernier is under obligation to terminate the negotiations. As in the earlier note, Bernier attempts to play upon the feelings of Consalvi stating that "posterity will have eternal reproaches for him who because of a quarrel over forms will have compromised interest so precious."

The stipulated five days had passed. According to the ultimatum of Napoleon the matter should have been closed. However, Bernier secured an interview for Consalvi with Napoleon on July 2, 1801. Under pretext of being presented to Josephine and Hortense, Consalvi had a second opportunity to meet Napoleon who received him with "much calm and amiability."¹⁶ After having questioned Consalvi about his letter to General Acton, Bonaparte continued to speak about the Concordat expressing himself "politely and calmly but with an unalterable firmness and the anguish of Consalvi was not diminished."¹⁷

The Final Draft

The following day, July 3, another conference between Bernier and the three Romans was held. The stumbling block was the same—the preamble and the first article. On July 4 a new draft was presented to Bernier which modified the first article so that it now appeared:

The Catholic, apostolic and Roman religion will be free and publicly exercised in France by those who profess it. The Church and the government, each in that which concerns them, will cooperate equally to remove those obstacles which might be opposed to it.¹⁸

In addition to this alteration there was also a modification in the preamble relative to the religion being that of the French government.

¹³ *Ibid.*, p. 224.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 225.

¹⁵ Bernier to Consalvi, July 1, 1801, *Ibid.*, p. 226.

¹⁶ Consalvi to Doria, July 2. Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 228.

¹⁷ Consalvi in leaving Paris had written to King Ferdinand "The good of religion wishes a victim. I go to see the First Consul. I go as a martyr, the will of God be accomplished." Acton received the letter, communicated it to Alquier, French Ambassador to Naples, who in turn gave it to Cacault through motives of jealousy. Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 229, gives a discussion of it. A more detailed account may be found in A. F. Artaud de Montor, *Histoire du Pape Pie VII*, Tome I, Paris, Adrien le Clere, 1836, pp. 130-136.

¹⁸ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 231.

On July 7 Consalvi received a communication from Bernier with some alterations suggested by Napoleon. In the preamble Napoleon wished the phrase "the government" to be substituted for the "present First Consul." He was willing enough to admit his own Catholicity in word but not to commit "the government" to a condition of Catholicity. In the first article he objected to the word "public." He wished certain modifications so that in effect religion could be circumscribed in its free exercise; that is, it could be "exercised in the churches publicly destined by the government for its worship."

Consalvi held firmly to his stand on these two points; he did yield, however, a little later on a minor point, the wording of the oath of the French bishops. He expressed his inability to accept the changes concerning the profession of Catholicity of the government and the public exercise of religion in a letter¹⁹ to Bernier on July 7. He very emphatically stated that if he were to admit of any restrictions placed on the public exercise of religion that act would be null and void since it would be contrary to the Brief of the Holy Father to the government.

In spite of Bonaparte's anger at Consalvi's mention of a Brief, "*Ai-je besoin d'un Bref et d'une permission du Pape pour gouverner la France?*,"²⁰ he did yield somewhat on the two fold question, the Catholicity of the Consuls and the public worship.

On July 11 Consalvi received a communication from Bernier.²¹ The French government maintains that it would be a violation of its rights as a sovereign state to receive from a spiritual authority the rights which by nature belong to the state. Consequently in the first article after the word "*publiquement*" Napoleon wished to be added "*in se conformant aux règlements de police que le gouvernement jugera nécessaire de faire.*" Bernier then adds:

I am charged at the same time to add that, by this clause the government does not pretend to attribute to itself a new right nor to bind the exterior exercise of religion that it professes, it wishes only to yield to the circumstances which necessity prescribes and not to oblige itself indefinitely beyond which it can act. It is merely a measure of prudence which makes him now regulate the public exercise of religion. He is not attempting to impose upon the Church a new yoke. Besides requesting Consalvi to yield on this point he also asked the substitution of a new oath. Bernier concludes with a bit of flattery.

You are the Secretary of State of the Holy Father, the successor of Peter. You can on these two conditions save the Church of France and assure the peace of Rome and Italy. Can you hesitate?

This, then, was an official declaration on the part of the government that the restrictions on public worship pertained only to external ceremonies, that they applied only to circumstances and that they would one day cease. In view of these considerations Consalvi consented on July 11 to the wording of first article as follows:

The Catholic, apostolic and Roman religion will be freely exercised in France. Its worship will be public, while complying at all times, considering the present circumstances, to the regulations of the police which will be judged necessary for public security.²²

On July 11 Bernier sent Consalvi's latest proposal to

Napoleon earnestly begging him to accept it, since it was "perfectly in accord with the liberties of the Gallican church." The Cardinal and Mgr. Spina had promised to sign the project thus stated. It was to the best interests of the nation since it would insure "the loyalty of the regions in the West and all Catholics in France." He further suggested that July 14 would be a most appropriate day on which to terminate the Concordat.²³

Bonaparte did not respond, nor express his opinion. However, he did designate his brother Joseph and Cretet, Counsellors of state, and Bernier to sign with Consalvi, Spina and Caselli.²⁴ On July 13 *The Moniteur* carried the following item:

*M. le Cardinal Consalvi a réussi dans la mission dont il avait été chargé par le Saint-Père auprès du gouvernement*²⁵
Presumably Bonaparte accepted the text of Consalvi.

Arrangements were made to sign the Concordat on July 13, 1801.²⁶ Rather early in the morning of this day, evidently before nine-thirty, Cardinal Consalvi received the following dispatch from Bernier:

Eminence,

The decision concerning the signature of the agreement was given yesterday by the Consuls. I am authorized to sign with two Councilors of State.

These councilors are Joseph Bonaparte and Cretet. All the documents had not yet been copied at one o'clock this morning. I will return this morning at nine-thirty to the home of Caillard, then to Joseph's, then to you. In the meantime, M. de Chateau-Thierry will bring you the book relative to the wording of the formula, if as I hope, he finds it in the library.

Receive, Eminence, my congratulations on the termination of your work and the homage of my profound respect.

Paris, July 13, 1801.²⁷

Bernier

There certainly is nothing in this dispatch to indicate that Napoleon has rejected Consalvi's proposal, that Bernier is in the least concerned over any aspect of what might arise later on in the day.

Talleyrand Interferes

At five o'clock in the evening on the same day, July 13,

²² Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 242.

²³ Bernier au P. Consul, July 11, 1801. Boulay, *Documents*, Tome III, no. 631, pp. 184-187.

²⁴ *Nomination des plénipotentiaires français*, July 12, 1801. Boulay, *Documents*, Tome III, no. 635, p. 196.

²⁵ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 243.

²⁶ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 246. The events relative to the signing of the document brought on a great controversy concerning the validity of Cardinal Consalvi *Mémoires*. There is a glaring discrepancy between the *Mémoires* and the official dispatches sent by Bernier to Consalvi. M. Le Comte d'Haussonville, *L'Eglise Romaine et le Premier Empire*, Tome I, Paris, Michel Levy Frere, 1868, in his discussion of the Concordat records almost verbatim the *Mémoires du Cardinal Consalvi*. Strange to say d'Haussonville does not indicate his indebtedness to the *Mémoires*. He gives a dramatic picture of the events on July 13, 1801. Cretineau-Joly, *Mémoires du Cardinal Consalvi*, Tome I, Paris, Henri Plon, 1864, pp. 354-360, gives the Cardinal's account. There are several articles in English, in *The Month* and *Dublin Review* which serve as a commentary on the *Mémoires*. (cf. bibliography) The dispatches sent by Bernier to Consalvi as given in Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 246, will form the basis of my discussion of the events on July 13, 1801. These dispatches were not used either by P. Theiner nor M. Boulay. There is a brief reference to them in an article by C. Constantin, "Concordat de 1801", *Dictionnaire de Théologie*, Tome III, partie 1, Paris, 1938, pp. 743-779. Because of the significance of these dispatches I will quote them in full. Mathieu found them in the Vatican archives entitled *Esame del Trattato di Convenzione tra la S. Sede e il Governo Francese sottoscritto dai Respectivi Plenipotenziari a Parigi il 16 Luglio 1801*.

²⁷ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, pp. 246-247.

¹⁹ Consalvi to Bernier, July 7, 1801. *Ibid.*, pp. 235-236.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, p. 237.

²¹ Bernier to Consalvi, July 11, 1801. Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, pp. 237-39. Mathieu considers this dispatch very important for the defense of religious liberty. He is the first to publish it.

a new dispatch was sent from Bernier to Consalvi "accompanying the copy of the project of the Authorities."²⁸ It is most important to note that a *copy of the project* was sent with this note:

Eminence,

I inform you that the conference will take place at the home of Joseph Bonaparte tonight at eight o'clock. I will call for you at seven. Here is that which they will present to you at first; read it well, examine everything and despair of nothing.

I have just had a long conference with Joseph and Cretet. You have to deal with just and reasonable men.

I offer you my profound respect.²⁹

Paris, July 13, 1801.

Bernier

This note is significant for two reasons. First, something unforeseen by Bernier had occurred which altered the proposal of Consalvi. This alteration must have taken place on July 13 between the writing of the first dispatch and the second, that is between nine a. m. and five p. m. Second, Cardinal Consalvi knew at five o'clock in the evening that a new draft was to be signed at eight; he actually had a copy of the proposed new draft.

The alteration of Consalvi's draft was the work of Talleyrand through his secretary d'Hauterive. Early in the morning of July 13, d'Hauterive brought to Napoleon a note at the end of which was a modified form of the project.³⁰ Four very drastic changes were suggested. Napoleon consented to the alterations thinking that Consalvi would yield at the pressure of the last hour. Little did he realize the nature of the man with whom he was dealing.

When Bernier arrived at Consalvi's quarters the Cardinal apprised him of the fact of the change:

There arrived Abbé Bernier who repeated to me with reassuring words that which he had said in his note, that we must not lose hope and that everything would finish well. We did not cease pointing out to him how serious was that which they were doing to us and how little foundation his illusions had.³¹

In a note to Spina, Consalvi states although they are about to assemble for the signatures he will be forced to call for a new discussion.³² It is rather evident then that Cardinal Consalvi was not taken wholly by surprise at eight o'clock on July 13, 1801, when about to sign the Concordat.

That which was presented was similar in many respects to the draft sent to Rome in May and there rejected. The concessions won by Consalvi at such great effort were retracted. The article on public worship was so altered that it subordinated the Church to the State. The rights of the seminaries, of chapters were ignored. A prominent place under Article 6 was given to the married priests. Cardinal Consalvi had repeatedly insisted that their position be taken care of in the Brief and not in the Concordat, thus scandal would be averted.³² These changes were the work of Talleyrand.

To justify the substitution of a new document at the time of signature recourse was had to the argument that "one always has the right to change the terms of an

²⁸ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 247.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 247.

³⁰ *Rapport rédigé par d'Hauterive*, July 13, 1801, Boulay, *Documents*, Tome III, no. 639, pp. 199-201.

³¹ Consalvi to Doria, July 16, 1801. Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, pp. 250-251.

³² Consalvi to Spina, July 13, 1801, *Ibid.*, p. 249.

³² *Projet de convention arrêté par les plenipotentiaires à la fin de la première conférence*, July 14, 1801, Boulay, *Documents*, Tome III, No. 643, pp. 205-210.

agreement which has not been signed."³³

Cardinal Consalvi, firm in his resolution to maintain the independence of the Church, refused absolutely to sign the document. A new one would have to be drafted. Joseph Bonaparte, Cretet and Bernier together with the Papal representatives worked for twenty hours, *sans formir, sans souper, en faisant seulement le matin un court déjeuner*.³⁴

Consalvi had the consolation on the afternoon of July 14, 1801, of gaining from his adversaries some important concessions,³⁵ namely: recognition of the Catholicity of the consuls, with no mention of that of the government; public worship "in conformity to those regulations of the police which the circumstances of the times render necessary;" the married priests were not mentioned; the rights of the seminaries and chapters were restored and the formula for the bishops changed from:

The bishops will nominate the curés with the approbation of the government,

to the following:

The bishops will nominate the curés; they will choose pastors only after having been assured that they possess the qualities requisite by the laws of the Church and that they enjoy the confidence of the government.

Before it would be possible for the French delegates to sign this document, the approval of Bonaparte was necessary. His wrath knew no bounds when he saw the alterations. Angrily he threw the draft into the fire.

That evening, July 14, Cardinal Consalvi and Spina attended a banquet at the Tuileries. The First consul in a dramatic outburst of anger placed the blame for the unsuccessful proceedings upon Consalvi.³⁶ The sincerity and calmness of Consalvi and the invaluable assistance of Cobentzel, Austrian Minister, however, made Napoleon acquiesce to another conference. He insisted, though, that the negotiations would have to be completed the following day.

As at the previous conference the six representatives were to work for hours without rest. Spina and Caselli, worn out by the labors of the past two days and seeing no possible solution, were tempted to accept the proposal of the First Consul. Consalvi was unyielding. He was determined to introduce a "restriction into a restriction" in the first article. It would thus read:

The cult will be public in conformity to the regulations of the police which the government judges necessary (he adds) for the public tranquility.³⁷

The French delegation considered this phrase redundant. Consalvi insisted upon it and concluded by saying, "If you are in good faith, accept my restriction. If you refuse it, it is because you are not in good faith."³⁸ Not

³³ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 252.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 251.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, pp. 253-254.

³⁶ The famous passage: "When do you leave?" "After dinner, General," I replied calmly. These few words seemed to startle the First Consul. He looked at me very intently and to the vehemence of his words I responded, while benefiting by his astonishment, 'that I was not able to exceed my powers' " according to Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 257, is not in the original text. The author consulted the original and compared it with Crétineau-Joly's translation. This is the only case of interpolation in the *Mémoires*, p. 366.

³⁷ Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 259.

³⁸ Consalvi in wording article one in Latin was very careful in choosing a phrase which would be acceptable to Rome. In rendering the French *en se conformant* he chose *habita ratione ordinationum quoad politam* in place of *sese conformando*. Mathieu, *Le Concordat*, p. 260.

only was the first article a difficult one but there were others, especially article ten. The "nomination of the curés would be valid only after having been agreed upon by the government." Such a wording was tantamount to heresy, for the validity of an ecclesiastical nomination would be dependent upon a civil power. To offset such a heresy, after twenty formulas had been proposed and rejected, the following was adopted:

Their choice shall fall only on those persons agreed upon by the government.³⁹

The Concordat Is Signed

Consalvi had the great satisfaction of thus seeing the Concordat signed that same evening, July 15, 1801. On the next day Bonaparte approved of the work of his delegates. The approval of Bonaparte did not of course mean the approval of Talleyrand and his interests.⁴⁰

The task of Consalvi was by no means over, but he could take satisfaction in knowing that he had secured much from the French government while at the same time he had preserved the authority of the Papacy.

There was yet much to do before the Concordat would be finally ratified. Rome was to discuss it, preface its issuance with a Bull and settle the thorny question of the Constitutional bishops and the married clergy by a Brief. This was the work of the *Congrégation Particulière*, guided by Pius VII, assisted by Consalvi. August 15, 1801, was to see Rome accept it; September 8, 1801, was to see Paris finally acquiesce. Yet almost a year was to elapse before the final publication was to be made, April 18, 1802. Meanwhile Napoleon was to draw up and publish simultaneously with the Concordat, the Organic Articles. These were to give the French government those very rights which Consalvi had fought so unswervingly to maintain for the Church.

Napoleon by his Organic Articles hoped to regain the power he had conceded to the Papacy through the concordat. Perhaps he did in the immediate scheme of events. But looking at the Concordat long after the sway of Napoleon had ceased and the greatness of the Papacy was augmented, the Concordat, paradoxically, did that which Napoleon feared most, broke the power of the Gallican Church by making the bishops and priests, not tools and servants of the state as he hoped, but a potential "army which might some day be used against him."⁴¹

Had Consalvi been granted a vision of the future, he might have seen with sorrow the long struggle yet facing him from 1801 to 1814, his exile and the imprisonment of his master. But beyond all this he would have seen clearly that these sorrows were of little significance in comparison with the greatness that the Concordat would bring to the Church:

The Papacy emerged from the crisis greater than ever. The Revolution had begun by presuming to regulate the discipline of the Church at its pleasure; driven to the wall as in an impasse it had been obliged to recognize that it could do nothing without the Pope; and it had come to recognize in that Pope an unheard of right, or at least one which no pontiff had ever up to this time exercised; that of deposing from their legitimate authority all the bishops of France to re-establish religious peace there. The consequence of this act would go far, would extend over the whole world. As Taine has said 'an indestructible precedent was established.' In the edifice of the Church it was henceforth recognized that 'the great corner stone' was the Papacy."⁴²

³⁹ *Texte définitif du Concordat*, July 15, 1801, Boulay, *Documents*, Tome III, No. 645, pp. 213-219.

Puritan Spirit

(Continued from page twenty-eight)

a right to a place as the scholastic philosophy."¹⁰

There was a generous sprinkling of Huguenots and Jansenists among other *philosophes* of the time as well. Young DuPont, editor and hack-writer for the *Physiocrats*, was a Huguenot. And Rousseau, who was certainly the most influential voice of the century, had a strong puritan strain through all his thought. He never ceased being a child of Geneva intellectually, no matter what his private life might have been.¹¹ His *Emile* and particularly his *Nouvelle Heloise* stress middle class virtues throughout; his indignation against aristocrats and abuses in the Old Regime turns out to be indignation against a way of life that was derived in large part from a tradition reaching back of Calvin into the Catholic past.

Influence on Benevolent Despots

These reformers, particularly the Encyclopedists and Physiocrats, were men who furnished the ideas for the benevolent despots' reforms. It is difficult to determine how sincere some of the reforming despots were; there is no way of knowing definitively whether they enlisted the advice of the *philosophes* because they were desirous of putting their ideas into operation, or whether they courted the thinkers of France because they were *à la mode*. Likely their motives were mixed. But there can be no doubt that the rulers were aware of the schemes proposed by the *philosophes*, nor is there any doubt that they corresponded with them, gave them pensions, had them devise grand reform projects for their various countries, hired them as tutors for their sons, and at the dinner table turned royal ears toward their words of wisdom.

Leopold II, for example, was a close follower of the Physiocrats and an admirer especially of the elder Mirabeau. Catherine II kept in close touch with all the leading reform thinkers of France. She corresponded with Diderot, purchased his library and paid him a salary as "librarian" for dusting off his own books. She entertained a visit from Le Mercier de la Rivière, whom Diderot picked out to guide her legal reforms. And she tried to employ D'Alembert as tutor for her son. Frederick II tried to match wits with Voltaire, and he offered the presidency of his Berlin Academy to D'Alembert. Gustavus III received each volume of the *Encyclopédie* by special dispatch as soon as it was published, and on his two visits to Paris he was accompanied by a body-guard of *philosophes* wherever he went. Charles Frederick

¹⁰ *Diderot and the Encyclopedists*, Morley, John, Viscount, London and New York, 1878, p. 129.

¹¹ Rousseau became a Catholic when he was about eighteen, but after becoming famous he returned to the Genevan church, which he claims he had never left in spirit. His moral preachments must always be considered apart from his own twisted personal life.

⁴⁰ *Rapport rédigé par d'Hauterive*, July 16, 1801. Boulay, *Documents*, Tome III, no. 646, pp. 219-223.

⁴¹ L. G. Wickham-Legg, *Cambridge Modern History*, IX, 188.

⁴² Fernand Mourret, *L'Eglise et la Revolution 1775-1823*, Tome VIII, p. 328. *Histoire Generale de l'Eglise*, Paris, Bloud et Gay, 1920.

of Baden corresponded regularly with Mirabeau and DuPont, had the latter educate his son and become a member of his council of state, and personally contributed a number of articles to the physiocratic *Ephémérides du citoyen*. The list could be continued to show how all the benevolent despots, like Charles III of Spain, and their reforming lieutenants, like Pombal in Portugal or Struensee in Denmark, were enthusiastic admirers of the French *philosophes*.

There is reason, then, for assuming that the reforming rulers had come in contact with puritan influences through the French thinkers of their age. This assumption is strengthened somewhat by looking more closely at the attitudes, the likes and dislikes, of the various benevolent despots. Joseph II, who is unique among the long line of Hapsburgs, stands forth as an outstanding example of royal reforming zeal. His restless physical energy, his insistence on being ever engaged in bustling activity, his constant travelling are all parts of the puritan virtue of busyness which, in Baxter's words, "God is most served and honored by."¹² This puritan quality is well exemplified by Henry Robinson: "The true temper and proper employment of a Christian is always to be working like the sea, and purging ignorance out of his understanding and exchanging notions and apprehensions imperfect for more perfect, and forgetting things behind to press forward."¹³ Joseph worked like an angry sea. Through his restless activity he churned out more than 6,000 decrees and 11,000 new laws in his ten-year reign. Like Calvin himself, Joseph worked through a malingering fatal illness—down to signing 80 decrees and writing a number of letters the day of his death.

Besides his addiction to and glorification of busyness, Joseph possessed numerous other typical puritan virtues. He could never enjoy amusements, partly because of their frivolous nature and partly because they were costly. He was abstemious in personal tastes, his mania for frugality going to the petty point of drinking only water and eating no meat but beef. His rigorous reversal of Maria Theresa's easy court policies drove old Kaunitz to complain: "On all sides I see nothing but taboos."¹⁴ It is therefore not surprising to find his most recent American biographer compare him to Calvin and to conclude: "Joseph was of the stuff of the Robespierres and Saint Justs."¹⁵

Joseph's reforms have a strong puritan streak in them, stronger indeed than his personal puritanism. His church reforms, for example, aimed at eliminating extravagance and at making the monks useful.¹⁶ His lenient policy

toward the Jews was devised, he admits, "in order that the Jewish nation . . . may become more useful to the state."¹⁷ In Belgium he tried to cut down the number of holy days and to have the *Kermesse* (a local festival celebrated on different days in various districts) held everywhere on the same day so that people would not go from district to district for the celebration, thus multiplying their "wasted" laborless days. His prohibition of "unnecessary" ecclesiastical decorations, his restrictions of processions and pilgrimages, his regulation of rubrics and liturgy were all in the direction of Calvin's reforms in Geneva—and for much the same social and moral reasons.

Nor was Joseph unique in this respect. His pattern of church reforms was repeated with variations by reforming rulers everywhere. So too were his attempts to secure efficiency, his glorification of physical labor, his attacks on the ascetic and contemplative life.

Puritanism in French Revolution

But the greatest reform movement of all occurred in France in 1789, a reform that soon got out of hand and became the most famous of all revolutions. Reform measures in the French Revolution, like the reform projects imposed by benevolent despots from above, had a greater puritan strain in them than is commonly known. It was, of course, a revolution engineered by and for the middle class, by men who were the intellectual descendants of the Encyclopedists and Rousseau, men who in surprising numbers were Protestants or else Catholics trained in Oratorian schools. Except for Robespierre, and perhaps Saint-Just or Couthon, historians seldom advert to the numerous puritans who played important roles in the French Revolution.¹⁸ Robespierre is usually considered the "Cromwell of the French Revolution" because he was "incorruptible" and because he intended to establish his republic of virtue through compulsion. He talked so much about virtue and he used such blatantly puritanical language that no one could miss what he dreamed of and stood for.

But there were many men of Robespierre's mentality in the revolution. To cite just a few cases: There was a number of Protestant ministers—disproportionate to the Protestant population of France certainly—like Julien of Toulouse, who was one of three Protestants on the Committee of General Security, or the Girondist Rabaut Saint-Etienne, who was "purged" in 1793, or Jeanbon Saint-André, on the Committee of Public Safety. There were prominent Protestant laymen, too, such as DuPont de Nemours, who first proposed the confiscation of Church property, and Barnave, who was an early leader in the movement until he fell in bad grace because of his "conversion" to moderate royalism by Marie-Antoinette on the return trip from Varennes. And there were the Jansenists, men of surprising piety and amazing severity, like Camus, who was a leader in debates on

¹² Woodhouse, *op. cit.*, p. 44, giving an excerpt from Baxter's *Christian Directory*, published in 1678.

¹³ *Liberty of Conscience* (1644), quoted in *ibid.*, p. 46.

¹⁴ Quoted by Saul K. Padover, *The Revolutionary Emperor* (New York, Robert O. Ballou, 1933), p. 107.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 222.

¹⁶ Padover sees the similarity of Joseph's and Calvin's reforms. He specifically makes this comparison in one place: "Like Calvin, Joseph ordered that 'unnecessary' church decorations: relics, votive-tablets, statuary, and lamps, be thrown out. The emperor forbade lights on sacred graves; prohibited clothes on the statues of Mary; stopped the distribution of amulets, the touching of pictures, rose wreaths, kissing of relics, and 'other such things.' Divine services, their length and number, were rigorously regulated; likewise the usage of the altar, church music, litanies. Pilgrimages and processions, unless approved by the authorities, were forbidden."—*Ibid.*, pp. 230-231.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 254.

¹⁸ It is significant that two of the latest works on the Revolution, Crane Brinton's *Decade of Revolution 1789-1799* and J. M. Thompson's *The French Revolution*, constantly advert to the Protestant-Huguenot strain in the movement. Brinton tends to emphasize the puritan element in many of the measures, whereas Thompson shows the puritan background and predilection of many leaders whom most authors treat simply as names.

the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, and Voullard, an ex-Oratorian on the Committee of General Security. Then there was the host of young men trained in the Oratorian schools, like Fouché, who cannot perhaps be called Jansenist but who certainly received and retained all the social and moral penchants of the Jansenist-Huguenot mentality.

Measures of the French Revolution, like the leaders, are more strongly puritan than is commonly thought. Robespierre's republic of virtue was only the culmination of a long series of steps that make sense and follow a consistent pattern only when they are seen in the light of puritan social, moral standards: the Civil Constitution of the Clergy, the new calendar which increased the days of labor each year, the public censorship of home life, the tenor of the new plays, the speeches in the assembly and the slogans in the papers—all these indicate how this middle class revolution has its secularized puritan virtues coming more and more to the surface.

No definitive conclusions can be drawn from the few points and the small amount of supporting evidence given in this essay. It would be a mistake to conclude that the reforms of the benevolent despots and the French Revolution were purely and simply puritan reforms. There were many other factors at work. But it can be concluded that there is a certain similarity between typical puritan reforms at other times in history and those of this period. It can further be concluded, it would seem, that puritan ideas were not foreign to the reforming despots or to the leaders of the Revolution. This is a point which has simply been overlooked by most historians. It is a point deserving of investigation, for it is of interest to know whether puritanism was one of the many causal factors at work in this age of reform and revolution, or whether reform and revolution by their very nature, directed against similar abuses almost everywhere, assumed a similar pattern in all places—a pattern not dissimilar from that of Savonarola's reforms in Florence, Calvin's in Geneva, and his spiritual descendants' in Holland, Scotland, New England and elsewhere.

Benedictine Century

(Continued from page thirty)

in this country prevented them from confining their labors solely to the Germans, even though he was particularly interested in their welfare.

On October 19, Father Boniface brought his little contingent of candidates to St. Vincent, and five days later invested them with the habit of St. Benedict, as is related in one of the chronicles:

Since they realized that "the habit does not make the monk," the circumstance of not having sufficient habits in readiness did not prevent the carrying out of the investiture. When the ceremony had been completed in church for six candidates, they returned to the sacristy where they gave their habits to their waiting companions, who then proceeded to the altar.¹³

Despite the many handicaps, regular observance was immediately introduced. It was not an easy matter, for the living quarters were particularly cramped. Although the church could be used for divine services, the rectory was still occupied by the Sisters of Mercy who had not yet completed the new convent they had commenced at

some distance from St. Vincent. The farm house on the premises was taken by the farmer and his family and could not be vacated immediately. The only available space for a monastery was in the school. This was a small building with one floor containing two rooms and an attic. Father Boniface thus described its use:

One of the rooms had to serve as kitchen, refectory, and assembly room where the lay brothers met when they made their meditations and kept their spiritual reading or received the ascetical instructions prescribed for Benedictines. The other room was the meeting place for myself and my students, and also served as a parish office. The attic was our common dormitory, where we slept on straw-ticks placed on the floor without the use of bedsteads. In the morning we were glad to get up because it was so very cold and we could not keep warm even though covered with woolen blankets.¹⁴

The daily routine was also strenuous, as can be gathered from a description that was given a few years later:

We arise at a quarter of four in the morning and retire at nine o'clock in the evening. We take no breakfast [the clerics]. At eleven o'clock we take a meal that is frugal but sufficient to satisfy our hunger. Meat is served on Sundays, Mondays, Tuesdays and Thursdays; on the other days of the week we partake of Lenten meals. Every day of the week at six o'clock in the evening, except Sundays and holy days, Lenten food is served. Priests outside the monastery, while travelling or at the missions, keep only the Church fasts. During Lent we have meat only on Sundays. The lay brothers are bound to abstinence of the Church the entire first and last week of Lent, and on all Wednesdays, Fridays and Saturdays; and they are exact in its observance. We assemble for choir service at four, six, nine, twelve, three, and half-past seven o'clock. Whenever it becomes necessary the students are called upon to assist the brothers in their work; and they do it willingly.¹⁵

Father Boniface had stated originally that the institution he intended to found would be supported by the work of the lay brothers. Three years after the start he again affirmed:

No other way can be followed than the one I have introduced. I have not yet solved the problem in its entirety, and I must still prove that I can support so many persons without any other assistance. I do know, however, that my purpose can be attained if the farm holdings are large enough and some little help is given through our pastoral charges. Even from our present farm I hope to realize my ambition as soon as I have completed the necessary buildings and have obtained sufficient livestock; and not much more is wanting. But to attain this everyone in the house must work, even the students when necessity demands it. Father Peter has often upbraided me on that account, but I cannot help it. Whether a student is ordained a year or two later than expected does not matter so very much; but everything depends on whether there is enough to eat. At other places there are vacations of two months for idling; we replace this with about three months of work, and the students remain healthy, strong and chaste, and at the same time learn how to manage a farm. If one leaves, he has at least earned his keep. If one wants nothing more than to be fed, he will not remain very long. The brothers also work the more earnestly and gladly because they know that everyone must help when the work becomes pressing.¹⁶

Despite these hardships, Father Boniface managed to keep the good will of his brethren and to preserve the religious spirit of the Benedictines, as can be deduced from a letter of Father Mueller to Bishop Henni of Milwaukee, which reads in part: "Everything is done in the spirit of the rule of St. Benedict, and Father Boniface enforces a strict discipline. Therefore I am expecting much from this monastery."¹⁷ On that account too he

¹⁴ *Bavarian Royal Archives*, Wilmer to Louis I, January 25, 1851. Cited P. Willibald Mathaesser, O.S.B., *Bonifaz Wimmer, O.S.B., und Koenig Ludwig I von Bayern*, p. 15.

¹⁵ *Munich Annalen der Glaubensverbreitung*, XVIII (1850), 135.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, XVII (1849), 146-147.

¹⁷ *Archives Archdiocese of Milwaukee*, Mueller-Henni Letters, March 1, 1847.

did not have to fear when he directed the following strong appeal to the priests in Bavaria:

Brethren, priests of Bavaria and Germany, woe to you if you do not help us! Our common fatherland is sending thousands of German brethren over the ocean to us every year, the Church hardly one priest for ten thousand. Do not say that you have enough to do at home, and that those who want the ministration of priests should stay at home. That is not the language of charity, of love for your brother, of love for our Mother the Catholic Church. Here, if anywhere, here the destiny of the Church, yea of the whole world, will be decided. You do not believe it? . . .

The Old World went to ruin under the crunching heel of the old Teutons. The Anglo-Germanic race will soon subjugate the New World, and then, being placed between eastern Asia and western Europe, will dominate over both. You cannot understand the tremendous power that lies in liberty, a liberty that gives free scope to every man to let him master his own actions and that calls for imitation. The young eagle of the free Union has only begun his practice flights and he can already be seen winging his way from one ocean to the other. If he becomes stronger and more experienced in battle through practice, you will see that no other can exist beside him.

Can it then be of no concern to you which principle is victorious, what kind of spirit animates the masses and reacts upon Europe and Asia? Do not the American advocates of falsehood continually brush up against the Catholic missionaries and oppose them? What would happen if these fanatics should gain control over the government? I know very well that God directs and protects the Church, and that He can do it without our assistance. But do we not also know that He punishes and corrects the Church, mostly on account of the sins of the priests? Was the so-called Reformation anything else than such a visitation? And the secularization — did it not come deservedly in many cases? If each of the larger abbeys had furnished only one of its members for the missions, how different conditions would now be in this country!¹⁸

The Century of Achievement

This plea was not in vain. In time the abbots of Bavaria released some of their subjects for work in the American missions. Some of these were of incalculable value to Father Boniface in the field of education, particularly important among them Father Peter Lechner. But in general the builder of St. Vincent had to rely on his own recruits from the United States after the first wave of Bavarian enthusiasm had subsided. Probably this was for the better since it gave a stronger foothold to the institution of Father Boniface, which was not only keeping to its original purpose of supplying priests for the German Catholics but was at the same time working for the larger interests of the Church in the United States.

After only three years Father Boniface wrote to King Louis, his great benefactor:

In a short time and with very meager means we have already opened a wide sphere of activity for the Benedictine Order. But our first purpose remains the education of able German priests, for the history of all ages teaches that without the help of an industrious and enlightened clergy the people soon lose their religious spirit, as well as their moral sense and true patriotism. A terrible lot will be the inevitable end of even the next generations in this wonderfully growing Union of North America if the Catholic Church has meanwhile not become strong enough to set up a solid bulwark against the evil spirit of heresy and unbelief in the hearts of her own faithful children by solid proven principles. Your Royal Majesty, no matter what false liberalism may contend, it will remain eternally true that even the most lofty sense of liberty which has sprung from mere human principles can produce nothing better than egotism. Religion — real Catholicism — alone begets patriotism.¹⁹

With his solid views and an all-consuming charity

¹⁸ Munich *Annalen der Glaubensverbreitung*, XVI (1848), 293-307.

¹⁹ *Barvarian Royal Archives*, Wimmer to Louis I, July 23, 1849. Cited Mathaesser, *Bonifaz Wimmer, O.S.B., und Koenig Ludwig I von Bayern*, p. 11.

Father Boniface thus laid the foundations for a lasting establishment. As early as 1855, and after overcoming many particular difficulties, he had the happiness of having his monastery put on the solid footing of an abbey and of being made the nucleus for the American-Cassinese Benedictine Congregation, which now embraces sixteen abbeys. He himself was appointed the first abbot. About this same time an independent foundation at St. Meinrad, Indiana, became the core for the Swiss-American Benedictine Congregation. In later years three other Benedictine Congregations also started priories in the United States. Although these are true Benedictine foundations, Father Boniface's congregation showed the way for real growth and healthy development.

In the sermon at the Golden Jubilee celebration of the Ludwig-Missionsverein, December 3, 1888, Msgr. Paul Kagerer said in part:

In the year 1846, a simple Benedictine monk of Metten, who later became the world-renowned Abbot Boniface Wimmer, started across the ocean to plant the Benedictine Order in North America. Our memorable King Louis I with acute discernment gave the impulse and most generously also some of the necessary means for the original founding of this settlement of St. Vincent in Pennsylvania. Amply supported by this royal protector and the Ludwig-Missionsverein, this establishment developed into the abbey of St. Vincent. When Abbot Boniface closed his eyes in death on December 8, 1887, it was not only St. Vincent that mourned at his coffin, but also three bishops, who had already come forth from the monastery, as well as four abbeys and five priories, which owed their existence to him. God alone knows how many blessings have gone forth from these monasteries, for they are active in the spheres of pastoral care, instruction and education, and they are continuing to expand from day to day. These monasteries are of inestimable value for the culture and civilization, for the religious and moral development of the regions in which they are placed, and far beyond these districts.²⁰

These benefits continued to multiply in the after-years of the order's first century in the United States. Full credit for this achievement must rest upon the solid foundation laid in the early years of this century by the far-seeing and energetic Father Boniface Wimmer, who was so ably assisted by the interest and the generosity of the Ludwig-Missionsverein and its protector, King Louis I of Bavaria. While he was assisted by the society, he gave to it a new direction and greater vitality by his seminary idea. This saved the organization from the precipice of a mere money-spending organization that would have led to ruin. Thus his memory is blessed in the history of the Church in the United States through the help that could be continued by the Ludwig-Missionsverein. And the Benedictines of this country can gaze upon him with pride as the originator of their glorious century of achievement.

²⁰ Munich *Annalen der Glaubensverbreitung*, LVII (1889), 7-19.

Council of Nicaea

(Continued from page thirty-two)

ing was brought to the attention of his bishop. In one version Arius publicly interrupted one of the bishop's sermons with the following syllogism: "If the Father begot the Son, he that was begotten had a beginning, and so there was a time when the Son was not." It is said that the sermon ended in a near riot.¹⁵ Arius next began to circularize bishops of the surrounding territory, especi-

¹⁵ Socrates, *Eccl. Hist.* I. 5.

ally outside of Egypt where many followers of Lucian were to be found. He succeeded in obtaining such great patrons as Eusebius of Caesarea (the great Church historian) and Eusebius of Nicomedia who had great influence with Emperor Constantine's sister, Constantia.

Alexander decided to call a synod at Alexandria. This synod, composed of about one hundred Egyptian bishops, made short work of Arius and condemned with him several others including two recalcitrant bishops. It is to be noted that this synod was composed of Egyptian prelates; Arius' influential friends were all outside that country. Meanwhile Arius, though excommunicated, went right on holding divine services while Alexander issued fulminations against him. Finally, Arius moved to Palestine to his friend Eusebius of Caesarea, from there he continued to circularize his episcopal friends and wrote his work *Thalia*. Meanwhile Alexander had started a correspondence of his own addressed to the bishops, in which he explained the quarrel and warned them of the excommunicated Arius.

With the political situation well in hand after the defeat of Licinius, Constantine realized that he must make some decided effort to bring about a solution to the rapidly growing menace of religious quarrels. He sent his Spanish friend, Bishop Hosius of Cordova to Alexandria to effect a settlement. Hosius seems at first to have thought the matter of minor importance, but when he reached the scene of action he saw the real bearing of the dispute. Someone suggested the convocation of a general council of all the bishops. We do not know from whom the suggestion came, although Eusebius, naturally enough, assigns the credit to Constantine. At any rate Constantine set about the practical details of organizing the council. The first plan was to hold it at Ancyra in Galatia, but as Constantine wrote:

... But now for several reasons it seems to me advantageous to assemble a council in the city of Nicaea in Bithynia. It will be more accessible for the bishops of Italy and Europe. Its salubrious climate leaves nothing to be desired and it will be easier for me to be present there and to take part in the assembly. Therefore, very dear brethren, I let you know that it is my wish that without delay you betake yourselves to the said city of Nicaea. . . .¹⁶

And betake themselves the bishops did with the Emperor's warm encouragement and free transportation.

Around the Table

Unfortunately we possess from the Council itself only the Creed, twenty authentic canons and the synodal decree. If there were Acts of the Council, we do not have them. Besides these documents, we have the accounts of later historians, Socrates (440), Sozomen (444), Theodoret (450), Philostorgius (430) and the relevant details found in the writings of members of the Council such as those of Athanasius or Eusebius. Many of the documents found in Gelasius of Cyzicus are very probably not authentic.¹⁷

The number of bishops present is not certain.¹⁸ Eusebius says 250, Eustathius of Antioch, 270; Athanasius in one place puts the number at 300 and in another 318. This last number is the traditional one and is frequently com-

pared to Abraham's 318 servants with whom he conquered the kings (*Gen.* 14/14) and rescued Lot, his nephew. The Council was a varied group: proud dialecticians like Arius; a great and cultured historian like Eusebius of Caesarea; the diplomatic Eusebius of Nicomedia; men who had suffered in the persecution like Paphnutius of the Thebaid with his right knee crippled and his left eye gouged out, or Paul of Neocaesarea with his mutilated hands. Then, there were some famous solitaries up from the desert, whose deeds were as popular about early Christian firesides as the tales of Kit Carson at ours. James of Nisibis was there, dressed in camel's hair garments, and Bishop Spiridion famous for his child-like simplicity—he kept sheep before and after being made a bishop. There were the two priests, Vitus and Vincent, deputies from Pope St. Sylvester, himself too old to come. It was a mixed gathering of saints and worldly-minded men from the East and the West, really a catholic council.

The Council probably opened on May 20, 325. Whether Constantine was present then or came later for a more solemn opening is not clear. But of that solemn opening in the Emperor's presence, Eusebius gives us a vivid account.

On each side of the interior of the central building of the palace were many seats disposed in order, which were occupied by those who had been invited to attend, according to their rank. As soon as the assembly seated themselves with becoming gravity, general silence prevailed in expectation of the Emperor's arrival. First of all, three of his immediate family entered in succession and others also preceded his approach, not of the soldiers or guards who usually accompanied him, but only friends who avowed the faith of Christ. And now, all rising at the signal which indicated the Emperor's entrance, at last he himself proceeded through the midst of the assembly . . . reflecting the glowing of a purple robe and adorned with the brilliant splendor of gold and precious stones. . . . As soon as he had advanced to the upper end of the seats, at first he remained standing and, when a low chair of wrought gold had been set for him, he waited until the bishops had beckoned him and then sat down and after him the whole assembly did the same.¹⁹

Constantine then gave a short address of welcome in Latin which was immediately translated into Greek. After his speech, Eusebius tells us, the Emperor left the discussion in the hands of those who presided in the Council.

Of the actual method of conciliar procedure, we do not know very much. Battifol gives some indications from his studies of the early councils. It would seem that such meetings were public, that each question was placed before the assembly by the president, that there was no voting in the strict sense, but the members, as was done in the Roman Senate, lined up on one side or the other. The bishops may have had many conferences before the Emperor's arrival, and Arius may have been invited to explain his theological position in person. At any rate his writings were available and quoted, and he had many warm friends among the members. It is also said that able dialecticians were present and took part, but the disputes between the Christian bishops and pagan philosophers which Gelasius reports are not regarded as authentic. Discussions were held every day, and the questions sifted well.

As soon as the radical Arians stated their position clearly, the game was up. If we view the members of the

¹⁶ *Anal. Sacr.*, iv, 224. Quoted from Mourret-Thompson *op. cit.*, II, 28.

¹⁷ Fliche-Martin, *op. cit.*, II, 69, bibliographical note.

¹⁸ *DTC*, XI, 402; Hefele, *op. cit.*, I, 271.

¹⁹ *Vita Const.*, iv, 10. Trans. cited from Mourret, *op. cit.*, II, 34.

Council after the manner of modern parliaments, Alexander, Athanasius and the vast majority formed the Right; Arius (if he was present), the extreme Left with Eusebius of Nicomedia and some ten or fifteen others. In the Center were a small fluctuating group led by Eusebius of Caesarea, the famous historian. As has been said, the great majority were on the side of Alexander and Athanasius. Athanasius, at this time a deacon, was noted for his strong defense of Christ's Divinity, but how much of a part he played at the Council cannot be determined. A small frail person, whose physical stature Julian the Apostate was later to ridicule, Athanasius was blessed with a deep, penetrating mind and presuasive eloquence. He was soon to become the Arians' outstanding antagonist.

When those who did not want to admit the orthodox doctrine saw the hopelessness of the radical Arian position, they tried to save themselves from a complete condemnation and from an explicit and exact profession of faith, thus hoping to leave the question open for further theorizing after the Council was over. To achieve this Eusebius of Caesarea offered a creed for approval. It was very probably the baptismal creed of his own church. It will be helpful to compare his creed word for word with the creed which the Council adopted.²⁰

Creed of Eusebius

We believe in one only God, Father Almighty, Creator of things visible and invisible; and in the Lord Jesus Christ, for He is the Logos of God, God of God, Light of Light, life of life, His only Son, the first born of all creatures, begotten of the Father before all time, by whom also everything was created, who became flesh for our redemption, who lived and suffered among men, rose again the third day, returned to the Father and will come again one day in His glory to judge the living and the dead. We believe also in the Holy Ghost. We believe that each of these three is and subsists; the Father truly as Father, the Son truly as Son, the Holy Ghost truly as Holy Ghost; as Our Lord also said, when He sent His disciples to preach: Go and teach all nations, and baptize them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost.

Creed of Nicaea

We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Creator of things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, only-begotten of the Father, *that is of the substance of the Father*, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten not made, *being of the same substance with the Father*, by whom all things were made in heaven and in earth, who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, was incarnate, was made man, suffered, rose again the third day, ascended into the heavens and He will come to judge the living and the dead, and in the Holy Ghost.

Those who say there was a time when He was not, and He was not before He was begotten, and He was made of nothing (He was created) or who say that He is of another hypostasis or another²¹ substance or that the Son of God is created, that He is mutable or subject to change, the Catholic Church anathematizes.

From this comparison we can see the points about which the Arians and semi-Arians would like to avoid exact terminology. The word "consubstantial" (homouousios) was very probably introduced by the Westerners, since many Orientals did not like it because they were afraid the term smacked too much of Sabellianism.²²

The necessity of the term "homouousios" can be seen from Athanasius' description of some of the subterfuges of the Arians. They were willing to accept the expression

"the Word is from God", for they said to themselves, "Is not everything from God?", and does not St. Paul say: "All things are of God", and "God by whom are all things"? When the orthodox wished to pin them down to the admission of expressions like, "The word is the power of God, the eternal image of the Father, perfectly like to the Father, unchangeable and true God," they agreed for they said, "All these expressions are found in the Bible applied to man, since man is called the image and glory of God." Since Paul said, "Who then shall separate us from the Love of Christ", the Arians concluded that the words "immutable" and "eternal" could be applied to a creature.

"Consubstantial" (homouousios) was the one word which blocked every mental reservation. Consequently, throughout the entire controversy the Arians fought this word with peculiar ferocity, accusing its users of Sabellianism because Paul of Samosata had abused the term in his heretical doctrine, and the Council of Antioch had censured his use of it. When the Emperor became more and more stringent in demanding the agreement of all the bishops to this terminology of "consubstantial" the battle seemed won. Finally, all but five bishops agreed, and even these five were narrowed down to two. So all but two agreed to sign the homouousian creed, though Philostorgius claims that three of the bishops wrote *homoiousios* instead of *homouousios* ("similar" instead of "one" in substance). However, with three hundred other bishops practically looking over their shoulders, this explanation seems somewhat improbable.

Besides the Creed and the synodal decrees which settled the Meletian heresy²³ and set the date for the celebration of Easter, which had long been in dispute,²⁴ the only other documents from the Council are twenty canons. Most of them are disciplinary decrees dealing with ordinations of clerics, precedence of certain episcopal sees, and the manner of treating lapsed Catholics and converted heretics.²⁵

And so the great Council came to an end. According to Eusebius, the Emperor showed the bishops every consideration and, when at his banquet in their honor the imperial guard presented arms, the bishops said that the "scene was like a dream." Though the date is not certain, the ancient tradition is that the Council ended on June 19th after a month's session.²⁶

²³ Fliche-Martin, *op. cit.*, II, 87.

²⁴ Trans. from Mourret, *op. cit.*, II, 54 and cf. note 82.

²⁵ For a brief summary of them cf. "Nicaea" by Leclercq in *Cath. Ency.*, xi, 44ff. An extended discussion will be found in Hefele, *op. cit.*, I, 355-492.

²⁶ Fliche-Martin, *op. cit.*, p. 91, n. 2.

LIBRARIANS

who plan to bind

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN

are advised to await

Index to vols. XX-XXV

May, 1947

²⁰ Translations are cited from Hefele, *op. cit.*, I, 288ff; 293ff.

²¹ The development of terminology differentiated clearly between "hypostasis" and "ousias" later on.

²² Cf. Poulet, *op. cit.*, I, 101. This work is excellent for its brief but scholarly, historical and dogmatic analyses of the heresies.

Recent Books in Review

European History

After Hitler Stalin?, by Robert Ingram. Milwaukee. The Bruce Publishing Company. 1946. pp. xv + 255. \$3.00

This is an excellent book, filled with political wisdom and a wealth of historical information on things European, but it masquerades under a badly chosen title. The book seems to have been written by one man whose understanding of contemporary history is penetratingly wise, but the title both of the book and of each chapter seem the work of someone else who did not understand the book at all. This is unfortunate, because those who will want to read this book will be repelled by the title and the chapter headings, and those who buy the book because of its "counter appeal" will not bother reading it. A good book like this need not be disguised to encourage sales.

The author does not try to find simple explanations for the complex events of history, nor does he seek clear, easy formulas for action in the future. Such thinking, he insists in the preface, is dangerous because it obscures the problem at issue instead of simplifying it; it is doubly dangerous today because of the political urgency for our thinking correctly and acting knowingly in European affairs. Mr. Ingram therefore proposes to analyze recent European history for the reader without giving him the intellectual sleeping pills of simple explanations and easy formulas. He rates the intelligence of his reader higher than publishers are wont to do, but his lucid style really demands little more than an open mind.

Mr. Ingram finds it necessary to go back to the French Revolution for a correct understanding of Russia's position in the world today. He then sketches the development of modern nationalism through the nineteenth century, into the first World War and the peace concluding it, through the period between the wars, and finally through the recent war itself. The thesis of the book is that nationalism is the red thread running through the rope of modern history. It is the truly vicious secular religion which has been at the basis of every explosive movement from the French Revolution through the emergence of Mussolini, Hitler, and Stalin. The author concludes that Russia must be considered an expanding nationalist power at the present time, that its nationalism has come in recent years to take emphasis over its communism, that it is rather as a great power in a world of power politics rather than as the cradle of international communism that Russia is to be feared today. He insists strongly on the point that there is no real difference between Nazism and Russian communism.

The student of history particularly will enjoy this book, for its pages serve as a path through European history since the French Revolution. Mr. Ingram acts as guide; and as he conducts the reader on this tour of the last 150 years, he points out many little things along the

side of the road that historians ordinarily overlook, he uncovers other things that have long been forgotten, and he offers wise comment on certain other things that have always been taken for granted.

The book is neither alarmist nor stupidly optimistic. Mr. Ingram realizes how grim this period of history is, but he remains calmly realistic and refreshingly intellectual throughout his analysis. He can, therefore, appraise Russian policy more sensibly than either fellow-travellers or alarmist opponents have done in this country. He can, therefore, see how the British foreign policy of balance of power in Europe is basically sound, how the British were muddle-headed between the two wars not in the objectives they chose but in the means they selected to obtain their objectives.

It is a book that will shock certain American sensibilities and prejudices—which is a good thing. The new light thrown on Wilson, who simply did not know the Europe he tried to straighten out, should serve as a warning to future American statesmen, amateur and professional. The evaluation of Masaryk should show Americans how easily they can be duped on European questions because of their lack of factual knowledge. And the occasional flat factual attacks on such historians as Shotwell show how American specialists in European history remain basically ignorant of European affairs after having consulted all the proper sources and delved into the right archives. All of this is what Americans must have thrown, like cold water, on their heads today. And Mr. Ingram does it nicely.

In two respects the author fails to come up to the high standards he otherwise achieves. The first is a matter of content; the other a matter of presentation. He need never have been identified by the publisher as a former Austrian, for his patriotism keeps poking itself into the pages of his book. This is a virtue in a man, but here it tends to be a defect in the author. He never mentions his native country except tenderly and praisefully, and he goes too far, the reviewer believes, in exonerating and praising whatever the Hapsburgs have done. To say that the Hapsburgs "magnificently administered" their empire through the centuries is overstating the case; to assert that there was never racial discrimination is to overlook Maria Theresa's anti-semitism—or to make a logical rather than an historical distinction of "racial."

The only other shortcoming is a minor one of organization. The book was hurriedly done by the very necessity of its subject-matter. As a result, though it is written in clear, readable English, the contents are not as well organized as the reader would like. After-thoughts seem to be put in later chapters, tangential remarks are occasionally made, and thus the reader finds his attention diverted unnecessarily from the matter at hand. This, it can be expected, will be corrected in a later edition—which this book certainly deserves under, we hope, a different name.

St. Louis University

THOMAS P. NEILL.

Bibliography of English Translations from Medieval Sources, (Records of Civilization, Sources and Studies, Number XXXIX) by Clarissa P. Farrar and Austin P. Evans. New York. Columbia University Press. 1946. pp. xiii + 534. \$7.50

For some time students of Medieval History in this country have recognized that their number is growing smaller with the passage of time, due mainly to the linguistic requirements which are pre-requisite to any specialized inquiry into the medieval period. The modern trend is away from classical studies in our colleges and universities and consequently fewer persons are equipped to undertake courses dealing with medieval history and civilization. The practical result is that in most graduate schools the medieval section has only a very small percentage of the total enrollees in the history department.

Medievalists are faced with the question of whether theirs shall become an esoteric group limited to the comparative few who can delve into medieval sources and literature in the original languages, or whether some expedient can be found to make the study of medieval times more widely available to those interested persons who are deterred by linguistic difficulties. If proper attention is to be attracted to the rich sources of medieval history and if the heritage of medieval civilization is to be meaningful in the modern age, either the study of classical languages must be revived to serve as tools, or the medieval sources must be translated to render them more readily available to all interested persons. Since it is improbable that the trend away from the study of classical languages can be reversed, the solution must of necessity be in the translation of the more important medieval sources into the English language.

Translations of sources are not a modern innovation. In the Middle Ages translations into the vernacular were not uncommon. In our own time certain select works have been translated, but in view of the large field that still remains untouched, only a beginning has been made. Such projects as the *Records of Civilization Series, Reprints and Translations* (University of Pennsylvania), *Nicene and Anti-Nicene Fathers*, and the various Classical Library translations are noteworthy. The latest project is the *Fathers of the Church in English*, the first volume of which is promised for the near future.

Once the need for translations is recognized, the next step is to ascertain what has already been translated in order to evaluate more clearly in what field or fields further translation is needed. The present book, the latest in the *Records of Civilization Series*, has been compiled as a guide to the existing translations from medieval sources. As the authors note in their preface:

Questions have frequently arisen whether a given work has ever been translated, whether an existing translation is adequate, or what relationship several translations of a given work bear to one another. To such questions no answer has been readily available. The present work is designed in some measure to supply the lack.

The book fulfills its mission most successfully. The task of compilation consumed a period of fifteen years and every page testifies to the industry, patience, judgment and skill of the compilers. When they began their work, the editors faced many problems, and they soon had to posit certain arbitrary rules if the entire project were not to get out of hand. Originally they hoped to

evaluate the authority of the text from which each translation had been made and the quality of the translation itself. However, the wide range of translation and its bulk soon caused the editors to modify their ambitious plan. In the present volume the editors have restricted their notes to brief indications of little-known works, to analysis of volumes containing several important treatises and listing of various editions or reprints of a given translation with an explanation of their relationship. They have also noted critical problems involved in a particular translation.

In addition to limiting their critical notations, the editors had to make a further limitation concerning the types of source material to be included. The compilers decided that since official papers—documents as distinct from literary sources—did not lend themselves readily to the alphabetical arrangement adopted for the volume, and since these consist of relatively short excerpts, they were not to be included in the present work, but would be reserved for a subsequent compilation. The editors, however, recognized that the distinction between documentary and literary sources is frequently arbitrary and that exclusion of documentary sources tends to separate material which should naturally be found together. They acknowledge, therefore, that at times they have violated their rule, as for instance, in including translations of early Germanic law and the commercial codes.

In gathering the material the aim has been to include the English translations of important literary sources produced during the period from Constantine the Great to the year 1500 in Europe, northern Africa and western Asia. The work would have increased its practicality had it listed where copies of translations could be found, but the editors, noting this omission, refer the reader to Pollard and Redgrave's *A Short Title Catalogue*.

The items, 3839 in number, are listed alphabetically by author except in anonymous works or where the nature of the material demanded subject headings. The Index of seventy-three pages is compiled with care and serves as an excellent cross-reference.

The first examination of the volume does not reveal the full utility of the work. As with most reference works, proper appreciation can come only from frequent use.

St. Louis University

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

The Story of Lithuania, by Thomas G. Chase. New York. Stratford House, Inc. 1946. pp. xiii + 392. \$3.50

Among the tragedies of the recent war is the fate of the small Baltic States which today find themselves incorporated as republics into the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. Father Chase has written the history of Lithuania, the largest of the three Baltic countries. He has traced her story from early formation, through the days of conflict with eastern and western enemies, through the period of glory when her boundaries stretched from the Baltic to the Black Sea and included under her sceptre most of present western Russia, and through the centuries of alliance with Poland. With Poland Lithuania was partitioned at the end of the eighteenth century, a small part being taken by Prussia and the rest by Russia. Then followed the period of subjection when the people struggled desperately to retain and to nourish their national

culture and customs despite the policy of Russification which forbade all manifestations of national life. Finally, after 123 years of suppression, the Lithuanian state was reconstituted in 1918. The period from 1918 to 1939 saw the new state confronted with hostile neighbors in Germany, Russia and Poland, but nevertheless making great progress towards the establishment of a stable government.

Hitler's pact with Stalin in 1939 and the subsequent German attack on Poland set in motion a chain of events for Lithuania which was to terminate with the obliteration of the state. Under the Russo-German pact the Baltic States came under Russian hegemony and a Soviet-Lithuanian pact was signed in October, 1939, granting the Soviet Union land and air bases in Lithuania. Then, while Hitler was occupied with his campaign of conquest in the Low Countries and in France, Russian troops occupied the whole of Lithuania. An election was held under Russian sponsorship, and the newly-elected government petitioned for incorporation into the Soviet Union. In August, 1940, Lithuania was officially "accepted" as the 14th Republic of the Soviet Union by the Soviet Supreme Council. Underground resistance followed against Russian occupation and reached its climax on June 22, 1941, the day of the German invasion of Russia, when a national revolt overthrew Russian domination. Russian power was, however, merely replaced by German power. Until the summer of 1944 the Lithuanian people suffered under the now well-known German occupation tactics. With the Russian drive westward and the subsequent surrender of Germany, the people hopefully looked towards the western Allies for a restoration of an independent Lithuania in accordance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter and of the Four Freedoms. Their hopes were not fulfilled and to-day Lithuania, considered as an inseparable part of the Soviet Union, is bound in the straight-jacket of Russian domination.

Such is the story of Lithuania as told by Father Chase. He makes no pretense of presenting an impartial, critical history. Basing his information almost entirely on Lithuanian sources, the author has written a very nationalistic history. He uses the Lithuanian names for the dukes, kings, cities and rivers of the country and the reader must often pause in order to recognize persons and places known under more widely used English names. Similarly, it is sometimes surprising to note persons like Kosciuszko and Mickiewicz—always considered as Polish patriots—labelled as Lithuanians. However, for the general reader interested in obtaining information concerning the nation which by its geographical position and history has played an important part in central and eastern European history, this book will serve as a good introduction.

St. Louis University

ANTHONY F. CZAJKOWSKI.

American History

Iron Out of Calvary, by Walter Phelps Hall. New York. D. Appleton-Century Company. 1946. pp. 387. \$3.00

The sub-title of this book, "An Interpretative History of the Second World War," is much more revealing than the title proper. Professor Hall shows in the first chapters

how the war spirit grew in the 1930's and how incidents became wars in Ethiopia, Spain, and China. He gradually—and properly—slides the world into war when Austria and Czechoslovakia fell, and finally, of course, when Poland was invaded in 1939. The rest of the book is concerned with the events of the war itself until the armistice was arranged with Japan less than a month after the atom bomb fell on Hiroshima.

The work could more properly be called "A Tentative History of the Second World War," because of the very proximity of the events Professor Hall describes and the limited sources from which he can draw his information. As such, however, it is satisfactory. Later histories of the same subject will see fit, the reviewer believes, to include the various allied conferences within the framework of the war story rather than as a postscript at the end. They will also, undoubtedly, adopt a more critical approach to the whole thing.

Professor Hall's book is highly readable, interspersed with many literary references. The reader sometimes feels that he is following the author through the galleries of Valhalla, looking down on the battle of the gods. But he also feels that epic events can be better described in epic form rather than lyrical. For a book designed for classroom use this lyrical tone is perhaps its chief defect. Otherwise Professor Hall has done creditably what few historians are brave enough to try—to write a history of things that have not yet settled and jelled into a pattern for the observer easily to see.

St. Louis University

THOMAS P. NEILL

Colonial North America, by John Francis Bannon, S. J. St. Louis University Press. 1946. pp. vi + 162. \$.85

Father Bannon belongs to that group of successful teachers who realize that a text should not be an encyclopedia but a guide to further study. His book on Colonial North America is thus neither a reference work nor a syllabus, nor a summary, nor yet a digest. It is a cleverly constructed account, in succinct chapters, of a great historical narrative. It forms a companion to class lectures, a direction-finder for students new to the field, an excellent library guide to show the learner where and what to learn if he would satisfy his yearning to solve the puzzles and problems implicit in the past life of North Americans. This kind of book displeases lackadaisical pupils, of course; and teachers who have time to read but one text in preparation and background search will not approve the design. Nor, for all that, will deans of studies to whom the system followed by an instructor such as the author is too much of an innovation. Yet if we wish to develop enthusiastic classes, we must show them lands to conquer, and then let them go on to the conquest with no more help from us than picturing the field and fitting on the armor. Such students there begin a lifelong practice of intelligent attitudes, and the habit of forming independent conclusions, the badges of university graduates.

For a forthright step in this direction Father Bannon deserves the praise of his colleagues. His composition in this work is superior. He has the gift of using language easily and aptly, and his chapters possess terminal facilities. They too form segments that actually fit into

a harmonized unity, for the story actually moves onward in clear and understandable lines across a defined piece of geography and through sharply etched groups of native and immigrant peoples, until the colonial effort in North America comes to its climax in independence.

In point of fact, this work is done with accuracy. The books listed—and in this case a matter of obligation to the student—are up to date and chosen from sufficiently divergent approaches. The planograph format keeps the price down, yet in this size ($5\frac{3}{8} \times 8\frac{1}{4}$) makes for quite easy reading.

Xavier University

W. EUGENE SHIELS, S.J.

Church History

Historical Records and Studies, Volume XXXIV, edited by Rev. Thomas J. McMahon, S. T. D. New York. United States Catholic Historical Society. 1945. pp. 189.

This volume of the Catholic Historical Society manifests a diversity which indicates the breadth of Catholic historical study in this country. The quality of the work is uneven. The most satisfying article is the first, that by Charles C. Tansill, Ph. D., "Pope Benedict XV's Peace Efforts"; the most provocative of thought is the last, "The Constitution and the Declaration", by Rev. Arthur F. Nugent, M. A. Two other interesting articles are: "The Episcopacy of Leonard Neale" by Sr. M. Bernetta Brislen, O. S. F., and "Catholic Eastern Churches in New York City", by Sr. Mary Constance Golden, R. S. M. As a frontispiece there is a "Map of Explorers and Missionaries" by Wm. P. and P. J. O'Ryan.

Dr. Tansill's article is both scholarly and readable. It was given originally as an address before the Catholic Historical Society at its New York meeting of November 17, 1944. In it the author sketches the efforts of the papacy to bring about peace, especially pointing out how His Holiness tried to cooperate with President Wilson to achieve this end. This effort is reminiscent of the labor of the Pope during the Second World War.

Father Nugent, working under the direction of Father Moorhouse F. X. Millar, S. J., undertakes to show that "the Preamble (of the Declaration of Independence) is a statement of sound philosophical principles which James Madison declared to be '... rich in fundamentals and saying everything that could be said in the same number of words ...' whose soundness can be best explained in terms of scholastic philosophy traceable to Bellarmine and Suarez. Such is the way in which the most outstanding and influential men at the Philadelphia Convention understood these principles and embodied them in that masterpiece of political genius—the Constitution of the United States." He proceeds toward this objective by examining three principles particularly of the two documents: equality, inalienable rights, and the consent of the governed. The thesis is not conventional—but the author presents his arguments with ability. It might be suggested, however, that the steps by which some conclusions are arrived at are not always manifest. If this thesis is to be read only by those well versed in scholastic philosophy such lack of detail and explicitness

might be supplied by the reader but if it is to be of information to other types of scholars the compactness could defeat the end of the work.

The predominant feature of the article on Archbishop Neale is the study of "trusteeism" as a disturbing factor in the early history of the Catholic Church in the Archdiocese of Baltimore. The recalcitrance of some of the members of the laity made the task of the early bishops very difficult, but it can also be said that the unworthy character of some of the early priests is a partial explanation of the rebellious actions of the laity.

The best part of the story of the Eastern Churches in the city of New York is that which deals with the efforts of New Yorkers to bring about a better understanding between Eastern and Western Catholics. The first part, an historical summary taken from a few secondary works, is serviceable.

In the map Father Eusebio Kino is not listed as a Jesuit nor is Father DeSmet given credit for exploration in the Oregon country. It is true that McLaughlin was the most important figure in that area but both DeSmet and priests from French Canada were instrumental in exploring the Northwest.

St. Louis University

GREGORY C. HUGER, S. J.

The Formative Years of The Catholic University of America, by John Tracy Ellis. Washington. American Catholic Historical Association. 1946. pp. xiv + 415. \$3.00

A contribution to church history, to educational practice and to the American social environment of the last half of the nineteenth century is evident in Dr. Ellis' remarkable work. The evolutionary background of the formulating of ideas for a national Catholic university is outlined interestingly and correctly, based to a great extent on the valuable materials contained in so many of the diocesan archives. Since some correspondence of key people in the era was lost or destroyed the picture may not be as perfect as desired. Moreover, the opposition, especially that of Father Robert Fulton, is not as clearly delineated as could be expected in an historical work of this compass. Nevertheless, this readable absorbing review of the accomplishment of a lofty educational ideal is portrayed so well and intertwined so thoroughly with so many aspects of American life that no student of any phase of United States history should neglect it.

This work is not a history of the development of the Catholic University as a leader in American higher education since its establishment in 1899; rather, it deals with the evolution of the University and of the concept of Graduate education up to that date. Famous names, great minds and small, adjustment problems, misunderstandings, excerpts from leading secular and religious newspapers and journals of that day add interest to the scholarship manifested in this well documented and well indexed volume.

A good part of the first chapter, "The Growth of an Idea", is an excellent summary of the development of American higher education on a real graduate level with the proper and necessary emphasis on research. Reference is made also to many of the chief educational institutions

devoted to higher learning in spots beyond the borders of the United States during the nineteenth century.

The publisher, the *American Catholic Historical Association*, and the author, Dr. Ellis, deserve no end of praise for this worthy knitting together of what previously constituted scattered, loose ends.

St. Louis University

WILLIAM A. FITZGERALD.

Book Notices

Inter-American Affairs, 1945: Annual Survey, No. 5. edited by Arthur P. Whitaker. New York. Columbia University Press. 1946. pp. 328. \$3.75

Suffice it to call to the attention of the readers of THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN the appearance of another annual volume in this valuable series, which has been noticed in previous numbers of this review. The present survey is characterized by the same fine scholarship and editorial skill as its predecessors, and it covers the same general range of topics. The statistical section, prepared by Miron Burgin, is greatly expanded this year, due to the fact that figures unavailable during the war years have been released to the public. As usual the concluding chapter, "Summary and Prospect," by the editor forms one of the most valuable and enlightening contributions to a work which, as was said before, is a "must" for scholars and libraries interested in the field of Inter-American relationships.

Seargent S. Prentiss, by Dallas C. Dickey. Baton Rouge. Louisiana State University Press. 1945. pp. xiii + 420. \$4.00

Included in the Southern Biography Series of the Louisiana State University Press is the story of an antebellum Southern orator. Although a New Englander by birth and early education, Seargent S. Prentiss journeyed to the South and there identified himself with its traditions and events. His contributions to the political and legal leadership of the South are interestingly recounted by the author.

Greece, by A. W. Gomme. New York. Oxford University Press. 1946. pp. vii + 131. \$1.25

The author of this volume is an historian of ancient Greece. Yet his travels during the past thirty years have acquainted him with the Greece of today. A picture of Greece as it was just before the outbreak of the second World War is presented, together with an account of its political history since it gained its independence in 1831. The general geography of the country is described, and particular emphasis is laid on the economic and social development.

A Short History of Eritrea, by Stephen H. Longrigg. Oxford. Clarendon Press. 1946. pp. viii + 188. \$3.50

This book gives an account, mainly historical, of the territory which since the last days of the nineteenth century has been called Eritrea. The author, who was Chief Administrator of the territory in 1942-44, possesses an authoritative and first-hand knowledge of the people and problems of the present-day Eritrea. His study includes an analysis of the present situation in Eritrea, and provides answers to the questions regarding the disposal and future treatment of the territory.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Historical Change, by Lewis Einstein. Cambridge, at the University Press; New York, The Macmillan Company. \$1.25

The Russian Attack on Constantinople, by Alexander A. Vasiliev. The Mediaeval Academy of America. \$4.00

Zachary Taylor, by Brainerd Dyer. Louisiana State University Press. \$4.00

The Congressional Career of Thomas Francis Bayard, by Charles Callan Tansill. Georgetown University Press.

A Short History of the Far East, by Kenneth Scott Latourette. The Macmillan Company. \$4.75

Suitors and Suppliants, by Stephen Bonsal. Prentice-Hall, Inc. \$3.50

The Epistles of St. Clement of Rome and St. Ignatius of Antioch, translated by James A. Kleist, S.J. The Newman Bookshop. \$2.50

The Catholic Church and The Secret Societies in the United States, by Fergus Macdonald, C.P. The United States Catholic Historical Society.

New Testament Life and Literature, by Donald W. Riddle and Harold H. Hutson. The University of Chicago Press. \$3.00

The Slave States in the Presidential Election of 1860, by Ollinger Crenshaw. The Johns Hopkins Press. \$3.00

Under the Red Sun, by Forbes J. Monaghan. The Declan X. McMullen Company. \$2.75

History of the Catholic Church for Schools, Vol. III, by Jerome Mahony, S.J. The Educational Company of Ireland Ltd.

Historical Records and Studies, Volume XXXV, edited by Very Rev. Thomas J. McMahon, S.T.D. The United States Catholic Historical Society.

The Catholic Church in the Diocese of Vincennes, 1847-1877, by Sister Mary Carol Schroeder, O.S.F. The Catholic University of America Press.

The Venerable Bede: His Spiritual Teachings, by Sister M. Aquinas Carrol. The Catholic University of America Press.

Alms for Oblivion, by George Carver. The Bruce Publishing Company. \$3.00

Most Worthy of All Praise, by Vincent P. McCorry, S.J. The Declan X. McMullen Company. \$2.00

The Sacred Scimitar, by Mabel Farnum. The Bruce Publishing Company. \$2.50

Fifty Golden Years, a Series of Lectures on the Liberal Arts College. College Of Notre Dame of Maryland.

The Devout Life, by St. Francis de Sales. New Abridged Translation. The Bruce Publishing Company. \$2.00

Our Neighbors the Koreans, by F. D. David. Field Afar Press. \$35

Maryknoll Mission Letters, Vol. I, 1946. Field Afar Press. \$50

A Look at Labor. Excursion Books. \$25

OUTLINE HISTORY SERIES

Ancient and Medieval History

(Third and revised edition)
by F. J. Aspenleiter, S.J., M.A.

AMERICAN HISTORY

(Second edition)
by Martin F. Hastings, S.J., M.A.

MODERN HISTORY

(Second and revised edition)
by Eugene H. Korth, S.J.

General Editor

John Francis Bannon, S.J., Ph.D.

Published by—

The Historical Bulletin

Saint Louis University
Saint Louis 3, Mo.

AN OPPORTUNITY FOR OUR SUBSCRIBERS

Renewals:

One Year . . .	\$1.00
Two Years . . .	\$2.00
Three Years . . .	\$2.75
Four Years . . .	\$3.50
Five Years . . .	\$4.00

We appreciate your prompt renewal

*Please send all requests
directly to*

THE HISTORICAL BULLETIN

Saint Louis University
Saint Louis 3, Mo.

ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY

ST. LOUIS 3, MISSOURI

Includes the following Schools and Colleges and Affiliated Institutions

CONSTITUENT SCHOOLS

College of Arts and Sciences	221 North Grand Blvd.
College of Arts and Sciences at Florissant	Florissant, Mo.
Graduate School	15 North Grand Blvd.
University College	15 North Grand Blvd.
School of Divinity	St. Mary's College, St. Marys, Kansas
School of Medicine	1402 South Grand Blvd.
School of Law	3642 Lindell Blvd.
School of Philosophy and Science	3633 West Pine
School of Dentistry	3556 Caroline Street
School of Commerce and Finance	3674 Lindell Blvd.
School of Nursing	1325 South Grand Blvd.
School of Social Service	221 North Grand Blvd.
Institute of Social Science	3674 Lindell Blvd.
Institute of Geophysical Technology	3621 Olive St.
Labor School	3674 Lindell Blvd.
Physical Education	3672 W. Pine Blvd.
Gymnasium	3672 W. Pine Blvd.
Auditorium	3642 Lindell Blvd.
Radio Station W-E-W	3642 Lindell Blvd.
Walsh Memorial Stadium	5200 Oakland Blvd.

THE CORPORATE COLLEGES

Fontbonne College	Wydown and Big Bend Blvds.
Maryville College	Meramec and Nebraska Avenues
Webster College	Lockwood Blvd., Webster Groves, Missouri
Notre Dame Junior College	Ripa Avenue, South Saint Louis
Saint Mary's Junior College	O'Fallon, Missouri

THE HOSPITALS

1. UNIVERSITY HOSPITALS

(a) St. Mary's Hospital	6420 Clayton Rd.
(b) Firmin Desloge Hospital	1325 South Grand Blvd.
(c) Mt. St. Rose Sanatorium	9101 South Broadway

2. AFFILIATED HOSPITALS

(a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital	3933 South Broadway
(b) St. Anthony's Hospital	Grand Blvd. and Chippewa
(c) St. John's Hospital	307 South Euclid Avenue

3. STAFF-RELATED HOSPITALS

(a) St. Mary's Infirmary	1536 Papin Street
(b) St. Louis City Hospital, Unit I	1515 Lafayette Ave.
(c) Homer G. Phillips Hospital	2601 Whittier
(d) St. Louis City Sanitarium	5300 Arsenal Street
(e) St. Louis Isolation Hospital	5600 Arsenal Street

AFFILIATED NURSING SCHOOLS

(a) Alexian Brothers' Hospital School of Nursing	3933 South Broadway
(b) St. John's Hospital School of Nursing	307 S. Euclid Ave.

THE OUT-PATIENT SERVICES

1. THE UNIVERSITY OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENT
Firmin Desloge Hospital. 1315 South Grand Boulevard
2. THE ASSOCIATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

(a) Alexian Brothers' Dispensary	3933 South Broadway
(b) St. John's Dispensary	4945 Audubon Avenue

THE STAFF-RELATED OUT-PATIENT DEPARTMENTS

- | | |
|--|-----------------------|
| (a) City Dispensary | 1515 Lafayette Avenue |
| (b) The Obstetric Dispensaries | |
| St. Louis Obstetrical Hospital Association | |
| St. Ann's Foundling Asylum | |
| (c) The Pre-Natal Clinics | |
| The Cass Avenue Clinic | |
| The Bethesda Dispensary | |

WHITE HOUSE

St. Louis House of Retreats—
White House, Box 484, Route 9, Lemay P. O., Mo.